National Anti-Slavery Standard.

VOL. XXII. NO. 34. NEW YORK, SATURDAY, JANUARY 4, 1862. WHOLE NO. 1,126.

National Anti-Slavery Standard.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY, ON SATURDAY,

AT TWO DOLLARS PER ANNUM,

BY THE

AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY,

At its Office, No. 5 Beekman Street, New York

AND AT THE OFFICE OF THE

PENNSYLVANIA ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY,

106 *North-Tenth Street, Philadelphia.*

Letters for publication, or relating in any way to the editorial conduct of the paper, should be addressed, "EDITOR OF THE NATIONAL ANTI-SLAVERY STANDARD, NEW YORK."

Letters enclosing subscriptions, or relating in any way to the business affairs of the paper, should be addressed, "PUBLISHER OF THE NATIONAL ANTI-SLAVERY STANDARD, NEW YORK."

ADVERTISEMENTS, 10 cents per line each insertion.

Selections.

GERRIT SMITH TO JOHN A. GURLEY.

PETERBORO, Dec. 16, 1861.

HON. J. A. GURLEY, M.C.—*Dear Sir:* I have read a newspaper copy of the Bill which you submitted 9th instant to the House of Representatives. Nothing in it do I wish to speak of save its proposed assumption of special powers over liberated slaves.

I had hoped that among the good effects of the war would be the recognition of human rights under whatever skin, and the equalizing before the laws of the black and red races with the white race. But your Bill is among the indications that I had hoped for too much.

"Short accounts" is a favorite motto with men of business; and they are quite right in outlawing such as have run beyond a few years. God also is for "short accounts," and for the prompt payment of balances. But where men refuse to deal with Him on this principle, He forbears not to go into long accounts with them and into reckonings that reach very far back. In His court no statute of limitations can be pleaded. When Jesus exclaimed: "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, which killest the prophets and stonest them that are sent unto thee; how often would I have gathered thy children together, as a hen doth gather her brood under her wings, and ye would not. Behold your house is left unto you desolate!"—when he thus exclaimed he referred not merely to her recent but also to her remote deeds of wickedness. Her centuries of now culminating sins were now to result in her desolation. So, too, it desolation shall be the fate of our American "house," it will be the result, not of a few, but of many sins, not of present provocations only, but of past ones also. It takes a succession of guilty generations to bring about the destruction of a nation. There must be great crimes, long persisted in, and by multitudes, too, ere the "iniquity" of a nation is "full." The killing of one prophet and the stoning of one messenger—the shooting of the prophet Lovejoy and the outrages upon the greater prophet Garrison and the seeking of the life of the eloquent messenger George Thompson—all this, aye, and much more in the present like it, would not suffice to exhaust the patience of Him, who is "long-suffering" and "slow to anger." He would still exclaim: "How shall I give thee up?—my heart is turned within me—my repentings are kindled together." These are indeed counts in the indictment. But for other counts with which to fill up the long indictment He goes into the wide and distant past. It is not until the present generation has filled up the measure of national iniquity that the nation is destroyed. Then does God hold that generation responsible for the sins of the past generations also. And He does this on the clearly sound principle that, by repeating those sins, and repeating them, too, in the instructive light of their appalling and destructive effects, it has virtually endorsed them and made them its own. The man who keeps the dram-shop or gambling-house, which his father and grandfather kept, is responsible for their sins as well as his own. By consenting to succeed them in an occupation which, whilst it was in their hands, he saw break hearts and multiply paupers and criminals, he adds to the guilt of its effects in his own hands the guilt of its like effects in theirs. It was on the same principle which rules in this case that Jesus held his generation guilty, not only of the blood of its slain prophets, but of "the blood of all the prophets which was shed from the foundation of the world."

Before passing on to make application of this principle to our guilty country, let me remark that I do not forget that what I call divine judgments many call the avengings of nature for the violations of her laws. Nevertheless, what are these laws which so many put in the place of God, and construe into the shutting of God out of His own world! What are they but the uniform modes of His action?—the fixed and unchangeable ways in which He works? And how quickly would they cease to operate were He to cease to energize them!

The great sin of our country in all the periods of her existence, whether under colonial or constitutional rule, is the assumption of special powers by her white race over her other races; and on the principle adverted to we are guilty not only of our own, but also of the past commissions of that sin. Moreover, if this sin is now carried to its ultimate height, then is our nation now to be destroyed. That her doom—"Behold thy house is left unto thee desolate"—is already pronounced, no man is warranted in saying—though every right-minded man sees signs enough of it to make him tremble. The breaking up of our nation is far more than begun; and so, too, is the march of her desolation. It may, nevertheless, have still left to it a space for repentance.

If, as we all believe, God has made of one blood all his children, then must this assumption, even when in small measure, be a high crime against His equal fatherhood toward them all and against their equal brotherhood toward one another. His love of them all is equal: and from this results their obligation to acknowledge constantly and cordially the equal rights of each other. But if this assumption, when so limited, is nevertheless so criminal, how immeasurably criminal must it be when the assumption is beyond measure! The Indians we have driven from their homes and from their dead. The Indians we have slaughtered, and, what is worse, enslaved. In the veins of tens of thousands of our slaves flows the blood of their enslaved Indian ancestors. To the negro, even more wronged than the Indian, we have spared nothing at all of his manhood. Exclusion from participation in political power and from all the rights of citizenship, unpaid toil and every insult, stripes and chains and death have been his portion at our unnatural, cruel and fratricidal hands. And can we still—even now when our nation is brought to the very brink of destruction, and brought to it so manifestly by pride in our own race and contempt and hatred of other races, and when, too, nothing short of the speediest and heartiest repentance can save it—can we, I ask, still continue to practice all or even any of our enormous wrongs against the Indians or the negroes? I think that we cannot afford to. You think that we can. For your Bill provides that the liberated slaves, and in effect the whole black population of the country (for it will come to this if your Bill becomes a law and the nation exists long enough to let it operate to its fullest effect) shall fall under the exercise not only of special, but, compared with anything short of slavery, exceedingly tyrannical powers. It provides that they shall be excluded from our political family, put under absolute dictatorship, torn from homes as dear to them as are ours to us, apprenticed without their will, admitted to only qualified rights of property, and so qualified as to pen them up forever in swampy, barren Florida, unless they shall be able to get themselves beyond the limits of unceasing and almost as universal as unceasing American hate. Yes, your Bill provides that in miserable Florida, where the general worthlessness of the soil is indicated by the sparseness of the population, our colored countrymen—our poor, peeled and persecuted brothers and sisters—shall be forcibly congregated, and put under the political rule of a handful of whites who, in such case, can hardly fail to become most terrible despots. Yes, it is in such circumstances that your Bill proposes to have the liberated slaves make their first-allowed experiment in agriculture and in all material and moral improvement. The experiment must *necessarily* prove a failure; and the failure will afford a fresh occasion for ridiculing and despising negroes, and will be unfairly and meanly turned into an argument to justify the oppressions heaped upon them—all their former oppressions as well as those provided for in your Bill.

I know not that any others will protest against your Bill. But I must. By my love of God, my love of man, and my love of country, all of which are deeply wounded by it, I must. It will bring our poor country into fresh perils. It will be a fresh crime against our colored brethren, and a fresh insult to their Maker.

Why, dear sir, could you not have framed a Bill, which would provide an easier lot for these brethren? Do you reply that their former one was much harder? I rejoin that the harder was that the easier should be this. Under the righteous doctrine of recompenses we should, if we could, make their condition now as much happier than that of others as it was before more miserable. All the greater is this obligation because our government was responsible for this more miserable condition—the received and acted-on interpretation of the Constitution making the government the great watch-dog of slavery.

I might reasonably ask Congress to do much for the liberated slaves. I content myself, however, with asking it simply to recognize their manhood, and withhold from them no civil nor political rights which it accords to others. For what else they shall lack to begin their life of freedom I will trust to private benevolence and to an endless variety of help outside the government. But would I let such ignorant men vote? Certainly, if other men as ignorant are allowed to. If the right of suffrage is denied to others who cannot write nor read, then, I admit, it should also be denied to such liberated slaves as cannot. But would I let them go where they please? The same right of locomotion would I acknowledge in them as in others. But they will be lazy unless they are compelled to work! Well, what if they will? Surely no others have so good an excuse for being lazy as those who all their life-time have been compelled to work, and that, too, without wages. But would I not have them punished for laziness? Certainly not, unless others are. And would I let them intermarry with the whites? That is a personal and private matter, with which neither Congress nor any other lawmakers have aught to do. Nevertheless, I am free to say that I see no objection to a colored lady's accepting the hand of a white gentleman provided she can possibly surmount her prejudices against his complexion. But another objection to granting the liberated slaves the rights of men, is that they will then rise up and kill the whites. They will be not a thousandth part as likely to do so, as if the rights had been withheld. I have not heard of a single instance since their full restoration to manhood in which West India black men have murdered white men.

I am not opposed to the colonizing of either small or large portions of our colored people. But unless we are prepared to acknowledge their equal rights and to place them on the same civil and political plane with the whites, the colony should by all means be outside of the nation. If within it, and the population composed chiefly of those who, according to your Bill will be but Pariahs, it will be a very inconvenient, not to say very perilous incongruity. I prefer the President's Message and Mr. Trumbull's Bill at this point to your Bill. There was great merit in the plan submitted by Mr. Blair a few years ago. It contemplated, if I recollect, no less than full civil and political rights for the colonists. The colony, it is true, was to be somewhere outside of the nation. But this, in then existing circumstances, was unavoidable. Slavery, which is now mortally wounded and rapidly dying, was then in vigorous life; and the slaveholders would not allow a black colony within the national limits. Ere passing from this subject let me admit that, in my judgment, were the laws of nature allowed free play, the dark-skinned races would find their homes within and the light-skinned races without the tropics. But, in all justice, let the dark-skinned be left as free to refuse to migrate to the tropics as the light-skinned to refuse to migrate from them.

In all our provisions for the liberated slaves our especial aim should be to have them contented. A war of races (by far the worst of all wars) is to be constantly and sedulously avoided. We are to remember that there are twelve or fifteen million of negroes on this continent and the neighboring islands; and that, through the force of her deep repentance for her enormous wrongs against poor Africa and her children Christendom will, ere long, be brought into the strongest and tenderest sympathy with all negroes. The day is fast coming when the negroes will be the especial care of many self-accusing and remorseful nations. It was Swedenborg, if I remember, who predicted that the "celestial people" would be discovered in Africa. If but a fancy, it is, nevertheless, a very pleasant one, that the ministries of penitent Christendom will be among God's appointed means for fashioning that "celestial people." If the twelve or fifteen millions to whom I have referred are not yet a formidable foe, nevertheless, unless we prevent it by just and generous dealing with them, they will become such to our posterity. Flatter not yourself that our emancipated slaves will be contented in [illegible] not. Never were they more discontented; and hence the British government hastened to take them out of it. But you will argue that your plan will bring contentment to the apprentices because it will bring wages to them. I, on the contrary, will argue that it will thereby bring additional discontent. From a false philosophy and a superficial view is it argued that men will be contented in proportion to the rights they get. A truer and deeper insight teaches that, the more of their rights they get, provided they get not all of them, the more are they discontented.

> "The pris'ner sent to breathe fresh air,
> And bless'd with Liberty again,
> Would mourn were he coudeun'd to wear
> *One* link of all his former chain."

Do not suppose that I argue from your Bill your lack of kind feeling toward the negroes. Anything which, in your judgment, would subserve their interests, and yet be compatible with the safety of the whites, would, I doubt not, have your favor. But you were probably educated to believe that one result of their unqualified freedom would be their violence and crimes against the whites. Under the like mistake were they who, both in Britain and America, predicted that the British Islands would run blood in the event of the emancipation of their slaves. They did not know how affectionate, how patient, and how slow to revenge the negro race is. They could not conceive that men, who had suffered such immeasurable wrongs at the hands of the whites, would, in their new-born freedom and new-born power, prove so harmless to them—and that too when the whites were, compared with themselves, but a powerless handful. Under the like mistake was it that several American vessels lying in the harbor of one of those Islands hurried to sea the day before the law of emancipation went into effect. So strong was the apprehension that destruction would sweep over the Islands the next day. And you have probably never given your attention to the facts which prove that, when you have blessed the negro with his freedom he is satisfied, and studies henceforth not to harm, but out of a grateful and loving heart to serve you. Moreover, you were probably educated to believe that liberated negro slaves, unless continued in some degree of subjection to the whites, must prove unable to take care of themselves. Nevertheless, there is the testimony of the British Islands to the fact that few people have ever made as rapid progress as their emancipated slaves in knowledge, virtue, and wealth. That the slaveholders and their allies, and tools, have been able to make Christendom believe that British emancipation is a failure, is, perhaps, the most striking instance ever known of the power and success of an oft-repeated and shamelessly persisted in lie. An utter lie is it—for, in every aspect and every particular, British emancipation is a triumph and a blessing. The unquestionable facts to show this were, only last year, admirably put together in a pamphlet by Mrs. L. Maria Child. The painstaking and accuracy of this eminently wise and candid woman are too well known to need my commendation. I have just now ordered a copy of it to be sent to each member of both Houses of Congress. I know not how a right-minded person can read it, and yet doubt the success of British emancipation, or yet doubt that our slaves, who are far more intelligent than were the British slaves, would by their well-doing reflect high honor upon the policy which should free them.

How grand the opportunity that has come to Congress! May there be no lack of either wisdom or courage to improve it! The Abolitionists had thought to persuade the nation to abolish slavery from high moral and religious considerations. But this great honor is denied them; and they must be content with however humble a place events assign them. It is now for Congress to abolish slavery as a military necessity. The slaveholders have themselves placed it at the disposal of Congress. May they not only abolish it, but have so much faith in truth, in human nature and in God, as to trust the liberated slaves with all the rights of manhood! Then will these trusted ones enable us to make short work of the war. And then, when the war is ended, they will, with the help of their Southern friends, and also with the help of their more numerous Northern friends (who, by thousands will go down to dwell with them, and be their teachers, counsellors, and comforters, and the guides of their self-help), make rapid progress in every right direction. And then will the whole nation feel joy and pride in the intelligence and morality of these pupils. And then, too, with her great reluctance to spare their labor, she will feel that if they are to be colonized it must be because they themselves desire it rather than because the nation does.

Our unhappy country! How can it escape ruin! A portion of our politicians would even yet be glad to compromise—and of this portion some would compromise on even the New York *Herald's* terms of giving up all and accepting the Confederate Constitution. Another portion, with the President at their head, persist in regarding the rebellion as but a riot—of rather unusually large dimensions, it is true, but nevertheless a mere riot, and one that is to be quelled at our own convenience and in our most agreeable way, and especially without the disagreeable help of these vulgar blacks. The defeat of our immense army on the Potomac may be necessary ere this contemptible riot shall swell upon the surprised sight of the President into the dignity of a war. Another portion of our politicians are amusing themselves with a variety of schemes, among which is Colonization, and are thereby diverting attention from the great struggle which is entitled to undivided attention. Moreover, forgetting the direction in the Cookery Book that the hare must be caught before he is cooked, they are for colonizing before catching the blacks. And how we are ever to catch them, if we continue to drive them from our camps and even to return them to the enemy, and persist in the policy of alienating them until the South shall be compelled to identify them with her cause by an act of emancipation, I for one cannot see. And then, what is worse than all, the whole mass of our politicians have, with very few exceptions, been trained to worship the Constitution, and to sneer at that "higher law" whose "seat is the bosom of God." They agree with Senator Trumbull that, not even by the necessities of war, must we allow the Constitution to be jostled. They agree with him that: "We will have gained but little in suppressing the insurrection if it be at the expense of the Constitution." Such gentlemen as the Senator and the President would not have the country saved unless it can be saved by rule. God multiply those who would have it saved anyhow! I confess my high estimate of the Constitution as a means of saving the country; and I confess, too, that I see not wherein it needs to undergo the change of a line or letter to make it a more effective means. But I deeply desire to have every man feel that, whenever circumstances arise in which the country and the Constitution can be stood by only at the expense of each other, the sacrifice must fall upon the Constitution. However precious to any one may be the Constitution, as a means of saving the country, let him still regard it as but a means, and then he will not consent to sacrifice the country to the Constitution.

Alas! this immeasurable mistake of confounding the cry of "Constitution" with the inspiring name of our country! when, in this name there is sufficient to move every heart, what folly and insanity to be summoning our soldiers to battle in the name of the Constitution! Many of them have scarcely any idea of its origin or objects. Not one in one thousand of them have read it; and not one in ten thousand of them cares a fig for it.

But even if the Constitution be as worthy of worship as it is so extensively claimed to be, let us at least agree to desist from worshipping it until the country is saved. Great, too, as may be the benefit of your proposed Colonization, let us at least agree to defer realizing it until the country is saved. Brilliant and novel, too, as is the President's idea of *swapping off* direct taxes for negroes, let him be content to joy in the bare idea until the country is saved. In the meantime, let our statesmen and commanders be moving their countrymen by appeals, which are unspeakably more full of inspiration than are any or all of these things which I have enumerated. By no such things as these did Marco Bozzaris seek to animate his brave band. And why should not Americans as well as Greeks be allowed to forget all these, and be told:

> "Strike—for your altars and your fires;
> Strike—for the green graves of your sires;
> God—and your native land!"

Although I had finished my letter, I must now, in consequence of having just heard the important and painful news from England, withhold it from the printer until I can add a page or two to it.

Alas that this news should find us still embarrassed and still diddling with the negro question! Alas, that we should still have one war upon our hands while we are threatened with another! Had we, as we should have disposed of this question at the beginning of the war, then would its beginning have been also its ending. If slavery was not, as it certainly was, the sole cause of the war, it nevertheless was that vulnerable spot in the foe at which we should have struck without a moment's delay. Instead of repelling the negroes, bond and free, by insults and cruel treatment, we could have brought them all to our side by simply inviting them to it. As it is, the war has grown into a very formidable one; and the threatened one growing out of it will be far more formidable. Whereas, had we not acted insanely on the negro question, we should have dreaded neither. More than this, had we, as it was so easy to do, struck instant death into the first war, we should have escaped the threat of this second one.

For what is it that the English press threatens us with war? It is for compelling the English ship to give up the rebel Commissioners. So it says. This is the ostensible reason. But would not England—she who is so famous for clinging to an almost entirely unqualified and unlimited right of search—have done the same thing in like circumstances? If she would not, then she would not have been herself. Had a part of her home counties revolted and sent a couple of their rebels to America for help, would she not have caught them if she could?—and in whatever circumstances they might have been found? If she says she would not, there is not on all the earth one "Jew Apella" so credulous as to believe her. If she confesses she would, then is she self-convicted, not only of trampling in her boundless dishonesty on the great and never-to-be-violated principle of doing as we would be done by, but of insulting us by claiming that we ought to be tame and base enough to forbear to do that which her self-respect and high spirit would prompt her to do.

But, perhaps, England would not have done as we did. Her naval captains have, however, taken thousands of seamen from our ships—these captains constituting themselves the sole accusers, witnesses and judges in the cases. It was chiefly for such outrages that we declared war against her in 1812. The instance of the San Jacinto and Trent is not like these. In this instance there was no question, because no doubt, of personal identity. But I repeat that perhaps England would not have done as we did. In a case so aggravated she would perhaps, nay probably, have taken ship and all. By the way, it may be that we did act illegally in not seizing the ship as well as the rebels, and subjecting her to a formal trial. But if in this we fell into a mistake, could England be so mean as to make war upon us for it?—for a mistake which was prompted by a kind and generous regard for the comfort and interests of Englishmen? Surely if England is not noble enough to refuse to punish for *any* mere mistake, she is nevertheless not monstrous enough to punish for the mistake, which grew solely out of the desire to serve her.

But wherein have we harmed England in this matter? We have insulted her, is the answer. We have not, however, intended to insult her; and an unintended insult is really no insult. If in my eagerness to overtake the man who has deeply injured me, I run rudely through my neighbor's house, he will not only not accuse me of insulting him, but he will pardon so much to my very excusable eagerness as to leave but little ground of any kind of complaint against me. Surely if England were but to ask her own heart how she would feel toward men in her own bosom who without the slightest provocation were busy in breaking up her nation and in plundering and slaughtering her people, she would be more disposed to shed tears of pity for us than to make war upon us.

It is not possible that England will make war upon us for what we did to the Trent, and for doing which she has herself furnished us innumerable precedents. It is not possible that she will so ignore, nay, so deny and dishonor her own history. I will not believe that England, whom I have ever loved and honored almost as if she were my own country, and who, whatever prejudiced and passionate American writers have written to the contrary, has hitherto, during our great and sore trial, done nothing through her government nor through the great body of her people to justify the attempt by a portion (happily a very small and very unworthy portion) of our press to stir up our national feeling against her—I say I will not believe that this loved and honored England will make war upon us for a deed in which we intended her no wrong; in which so far as her own example is authority there is no wrong; and in which in the light of reason, and as it will prove in the judgment of mankind, there is no wrong. She could not make such a causeless war upon us without deeply and broadly blotting her own character and the character of modern civilization. But, after all, what better is our modern civilization than a mere blot and botch if the nation, which is preëminently its exponent, can be guilty, and without the least real cause of provocation and upon pretexts as frivolous as they are false, of seeking to destroy a sister nation?—a sister nation, too, whose present embarrassments and distresses appeal so strongly to every good heart? Moreover, how little will it argue for the cause of human rights and popular institutions, if the nation, which claims to be the chief champion of that cause, can wage so wicked a war upon a nation claiming no humbler a relation to that precious cause.

What, then, do I hold that England should do in this case?

1st. Reprimand or more severely punish the captain of the Trent for his very gross and very guilty violation of our rights in furnishing exceedingly important facilities to our enemy. This our government should have promptly insisted on, and not have suffered England to get the start of us with her absurd counter claim. This is a case in which not we but England should have been made defendant. It is her captain who is the real offender. Ours is, at the most, but a nominal one. In the conduct of her captain were the spirit and purpose, as well as the doing of wrong. The conduct of ours, on the contrary, was prompted by the spirit and purpose of doing right: and if in any respect it was erroneous, it was simply in regard to the *forms* of doing right. Moreover, the guilt of her captain can be diminished by nothing that was seemingly or really guilty in ours. The criminality of taking the rebels into the Trent was none the less because of any mistakes which attended the getting of them out. Nevertheless, England takes no action against him. Her policy is to have her guilty Captain lost sight of in her bluster about our innocent one. To screen the thief she cries, "Stop thief!" Her policy is to prevent us from getting the true issue before the public mind, by occupying it with her false one.

How preposterous is the claim of England to her right to make war because we took our rebellious subjects from her ship! The taking of them into her ship is the only thing in the case which can possibly furnish cause of war. *That*, unless amply apologized for, does, in the light of international law, furnish abundant cause of war.

Did ever hypocrisy and impudence go farther than in England's putting America on trial? Was there ever a more emphatic "putting of the saddle on the wrong horse?" I overtake the thief who has stolen my watch, and jerk it from his pocket. He turns to the people not to confess his theft, but to protest against my rudeness and to have me instead of himself regarded as the criminal.

An old fable tells us that a council of animals with the lion at their head put an ass on trial for having "broused the bigness of his tongue." The lion (England) was constrained to confess that he had himself eaten sheep and shepherds too. Nevertheless it was the offence of the ass (America) that caused the council to shudder with horror. "What! eat another's grass? O shame!" And so the virtuous rascals condemned him to die, and rejoiced anew in their conscious innocence.

Moreover, England, instead of turning to her own conscience with the true case, has the brazen effrontery to appeal to our conscience with her trumped-up case. Which of the parties in this instance needs conscience-quickening is no less certain than in the instance of the footpad and the traveller, whom he had robbed of his bags of gold. The poor traveller meekly asked for a few coins to defray his expenses homeward. "Take them from one of the bags," said the footpad with an air of chivalrous magnanimity. But on seeing the traveller take half a dozen instead of two or three, he exclaimed, "Why, man! have you no conscience?" England, through her subject and servant, entered into a conspiracy against America. America, through her subject and servant, forbore to punish the wickedness, and simply stopped it. And yet England bids us to our conscience!

Why should England protect her captain? Her Queen, in her last May's proclamation, warned him that for doing what he has done he should "in no wise obtain any protection." He had full knowledge of the official character of the rebels, and at least inferential knowledge of their bearing dispatches with them. But [illegible] that, the whole spirit of it is against what he has done, her proclamation specifies "officers" and "despatches" in the list of what her subjects are prohibited to carry "for the use or service of either of the contending parties."

England did not protect the captain of her mail steamer Teviot, who, during our war with Mexico, was guilty of carrying the Mexican General Parades. He was suspended. Why does she spare the captain of the Trent? Is it because she has more sympathy with the Southern Confederacy than she had with Mexico? and is, therefore, more tender toward him who serves the former than she was toward him who served the latter? But it will perhaps be said that we have not demanded satisfaction in this case as we did in that. England, nevertheless, knows that we are entitled to it: and that she is bound to satisfy us for the wrong she did us, before she complains of the way we took to save ourselves from the deep injury with which that great and guilty wrong threatened us. In this connection I add that if, upon her own principles and precedents, the Captain of the Trent deserves punishment for what he did, she is estopped from magnifying into a grave offence our undoing what he did.

2d. The next thing which England should do is to give instructions, or rather to repeat those in the Queen's proclamation, that no more rebel Commissioners be received into her vessels.

3d. And then she should inform us whether in the case of a vessel that shall hereafter offend in this wise, she would have us take the vessel itself, or take but the Commissioners. It is true that whatever her preference we would probably insist in every case in taking the vessel: for it is not probable that we shall again expose ourselves in such a case to the charge of taking too little. It is however also true, that should she prefer our taking the vessel, we will *certainly* never take less.

But such instructions and information, although they would provide for future cases, would leave the present case unprovided for; and England might still say that she could not acquiesce in our having in this case taken the Commissioners instead of the vessel. What then? She ought to be content with the expression of our regret; that we did not take the mode of her choice, and the more so as that mode could have been followed by no different result in respect to our getting possession of the Commissioners. But this might not satisfy her: and what then? She should generously wait until this unnatural and horrid war is off our hands; and if the parties could not then agree they should submit the case to an Umpire. If however she should call for an Umpire *now*, then although the civilized world would think badly of her for it and our own nation be very slow to forgive her for it, I would nevertheless, in my abhorrence of all war, have our government consent to an Umpire *now*. Nay, in the spirit of this abhorrence and for the sake of peace I would go much farther. If no other concession we could make would satisfy England, I would have our government propose to surrender the rebels Mason and Slidell, in case the English government would say distinctly and solemnly that it would not itself disturb neutral vessels having on board rebels who had gone out from England in quest of foreign aid to overturn the English government. An ineffably base government would it prove itself to be should it refuse to say this, and yet declare war on the ground of our capture of rebels who were on their way for foreign help to overturn our government.

I spoke of my abhorrence of all war. Our life-long opponents of war find themselves unexpectedly in sympathy with mighty armies. They have to confess that they never anticipated a rebellion so vast. Still less did they ever anticipate that England would be guilty of coming to the help of such a satanic rebellion.

I have said that England will not go to war with us in the case of the Trent. Nevertheless I am not without fear that her government will be driven to declare war against us. The government of no other nation (and this is honorable to England) is more influenced by the people. By such an affair as the capture of Mason and Slidell the patriotism of the least-informed and superficial and excitable part of her people is easily and extensively wrought upon. With this part of her people the inviolability of the British flag is more than all earth besides. But it is not by that capture nor by those classes to whom it appeals with such peculiar power that the government will be moved. If an irresistible pressure comes upon the government it will come from those portions of the people who long for the cotton and the free trade of the South, and who have allowed themselves to get angry with the North by foolishly misconstruing our high tariff (which is simply a necessary war measure) into a *hostile commercial measure*. The capture of Mason and Slidell will be only the pretext, not the provocation; only the occasion not the cause of the war.

If England wishes to go to war with us for any wrongs we have done her, she shall not have the chance—for we will promptly repair the wrongs at whatever sacrifice of property or pride. But if, as I still love and honor her too much to believe, she wishes to go to war with us at any rate, and chooses this, our time of trouble, as her time to make us an easy prey, then will she be gratified. It will be but fair, however, to advertise her that she must not take our fighting in the war with the rebels as a sample of what will be our fighting in the war with herself. The former is fooling. The latter will be fighting. On all subjects connected with slavery, and, therefore, in a war about slavery, we Americans are fools. We cannot help it. We have worshipped the idol so long and so devoutly that, when in its all-influential presence, we cannot be men. The powers of our moral nature are, however, not destroyed. They are but perverted. And such an outrage as the English press threatens us with will restore their legitimate use. Our manhood is not dead. It but sleeps. And, as it was when the Philistines fell upon bound Samson, that the spirit of the Lord came to help, so when the English shall fall upon the worse-bound Americans, this sleeping manhood will awake. And it will awake to assert itself not merely against the English, but against the rebels also. And it will do this mightily, because it will, at the same time, be asserting itself against its own life-long degradations and the hateful cause of them. Let us but know that England, to whom we have done no wrong, has resolved to come to the help of the pro-slavery rebellion, and our deep indignation against her, combining with our deeper indignation against ourselves, will arm us with the spirit and the power to snap the "cords" and "green withs" and "new ropes" with which slavery has bound us, and to dash to the dust the foul idol whose worship has so demented and debased us. Yes, let us hear this month that England has declared war against us, and this month will witness our Proclamation of Liberty to every slave in the land. No thanks will be due her for the happy effect upon us of her declaration of war. No thanks will be due her that the declaration will have the effect to save us—to save us by making us anti-slavery. No more halfway measures, and no more nonsense on the subject of slavery shall we then propose. There will be no more talk, then, of freeing one sort of slaves and continuing the other in slavery. But we shall then invite every negro in the land, bond and free, to identify himself "arm and soul" with our cause. And then there will be no more talk of colonizing and apprenticing them. Then we shall be eager to lift up the negroes into the enjoyment of all the rights of manhood, that so we may have in them *men* to stand by our side and help us make short work with the present war and with that with which we are threatened.

Owing to the bewitching and debauching influence of slavery upon our whole nation there are, even in the free States, divisions among us in regard to the present war. But should England, so causelessly, cruelly and meanly, force a war upon us, there will be no divisions among us in regard to that war; nor, indeed, will there then be in regard to the other. And so deep and abiding will be our sense of her boundless injustice, that there will never be any among us to welcome propositions of peace with England, until her war with us shall have reached the result of our subjugation or of her expulsion from every part of the continent of North America. Moreover, we shall rejoice to hear of the crushing of her power everywhere—for we shall feel that, the nation which can be guilty of such a war is fit to govern nowhere—in the Eastern no more than in the Western hemisphere.

Respectfully yours, GERRIT SMITH.

THE NEGRO-WHIPPING COL. GORMAN.

From The Tribune.

INCIDENTS are sometimes related to us on such authority that we are not willing to pronounce them untrue and suppress them, for, strong as our inclination is not to believe them, they ought, if true, to be made public. Here is one of them: We are told that two slaves, belonging to Maryland citizens near the camp of the 1st Minnesota Regiment, went within the lines and sold, or offered to sell, liquor to the men. If it is true that at this very time the sutler of the regiment was doing the same thing, that fact should have been some palliation of the offence against discipline by two ignorant slaves; it was not permitted to be, however, and the men were, plantation fashion, seized, stripped to the waist, tied up, and whipped by order and in the presence of Col. Gorman, the commander of the regiment. This punishment was given by two of the soldiers who were under arrest for some offence of their own.

On another occasion Col. Gorman is reported to have taken the discipline of a negro into his own hands. A fugitive, who had been ill, was made his servant. Not having recovered his strength, he did not move quickly enough to suit his master, who thereupon fell upon him, beat him, and drove him from the camp.

We repeat that these stories appear incredible to us, but we do not feel at liberty to withhold them. Col. Gorman's name is about to come before the Senate for confirmation as a Brigadier-General. A statement of this sort, made on good authority, should be inquired into, as we need gentlemen and not "nigger-drivers" as officers of the Union army.

Correspondence of The N. Y. Tribune.

FIRST MINNESOTA REGIMENT,
CAMP STONE, Md., Dec. 16, 1861.

In *The Tribune* of the 13th inst., there appeared in your editorial columns an article in relation to the manner in which Col. Gorman had treated certain slaves. As there were several mistakes in the article, I have deemed fit to send you a true statement of the whole affair, so far as it has come to my knowledge. The sutler of the regiment had been in the habit of vending liquors to the men—with the knowledge and implied, if not direct, consent of the Colonel—for which he demanded and received exorbitant prices. Several of the men got passes and went outside of the camp, and after a diligent search found three slaves, of whom they got some whiskey, but not until after much entreaty. This fact coming to the knowledge of Col. Gorman, he sent a guard to arrest the offenders and bring them into camp, which was done. The Colonel—"to make an example of them," he said—had two of them tied securely to some posts, and then directed that they should receive a number of lashes at the hands of the men to whom they had sold the liquor—twenty-one lashes each was, I think, the allotment. The remaining negro was "spared on account of his extreme age." The Colonel stood by while the men were being whipped, cursing the whippers for not striking hard enough, and to a bystander, whose feelings revolted at the inhumanity, and who gave utterance thereto, the "master" said, "Insubordination, sir, insubordination; another word from you, and G—d d—n my soul to h—l if I don't have you whipped too."

One would have supposed that now the Colonel had taken such a decided stand against the liquor traffic, he would turn his attention to abolishing it in the sutler's department; but no, the sutler could do as he pleased, it was criminal only in a slave. The sutler continued to deal in the "ardent," until Col. Dana took command of the regiment, when an examination of sutler's stores was made, which resulted in the discovery of nearly two hundred dollars' worth of liquors; these liquors were destroyed by Col. Dana, who informed Mr. King, that unless the sale was discontinued altogether, the establishment would be discontinued. Since then no liquors have been kept by the sutler; if they have, they are "kept" out of sight.

As to the fugitive slave, whom the Colonel had pressed into his service, being beaten, I have no means of knowing. It is, however, a matter of common rumor; and is believed by those who are best acquainted with Gorman.

It may be interesting to know that a majority of the officers of this regiment, who signed a paper recommending Gorman for Brigadier-General, did so *to get rid of him as Colonel*. This is an acknowledged fact, and no one will dispute it.

Those who know the man best wish to have but little to do with him; among whom is

"A LITTLE MORE GRAPE."

OPINION AND FEELING IN FRANCE.

Paris Correspondence of The Tribune.

It is sad—doubtless erroneous, but demonstrably true—that the foremost statesmen of America, tried by European standards, are Jeff. Davis, Wendell Phillips, and Col. Cochrane. Jeff. Davis's Message is reprinted here in the daily journals, to the advantage of him and his cause. Shrewd ones note that Jeff. says nothing of slaves and slavery—as they have noted similar silence in the official documents, spoken and written, of his opponents. No official act of the United States government, published up to the last American dates, shows on the part of that government even the slightest divergence from the views and aims of the rebels in respect to the slavery question. Note the sad fact when noting the lamentable lack of European sympathy for our cause. When shall we have what the French call "the courage of our opinions?" Are Col. Cochrane's "views"—applauded here since the last mail—are these only sound views to be swaggered about and let pass as dissolving views? A proclamation of universal human liberty, issued three months ago by our government, would have secured all friends, and silenced all foes. Issued to-day, even, it would strengthen all friends and baffle all foes. But always to hesitate, never to dare; to talk freedom and do slavery; not to dare now, even now, to strike the enemy where they are weak, but rather by all means comfort and aid them; to defend exactly what the enemy defends, and drive neutrals into *its* alliance!

God forgive me, if forgiveness is needed, for indulging (I protest against "these unpatriotic sentiments") in this painfully truthful report of French views of things, etc. *Amicus Plato, amicus Socrates, sed magis amica veritas.*

Should war ensue between Great Britain and the United States, France would begin with being neutral—armed neutrality, with readiness for mediation. How long France would or could remain neutral; how soon European complications would mingle with the elements of her Anglo-American neutrality, and quite transform its quality, any American observer of the actual tangled situation of Europe can guess as well as your correspondent.

It requires no prophetic vision to see, meantime, that only one thing can prevent the recognition by England and France of the independence of the C. S. A.—to wit, our proving, not by verbal blatherskyte, but by facts, that the C. S. A. is dependent on us. The frank renunciation of our impossible policy of attacking and defending the peculiar institution—of "crushing out a rebellion" without so much as squeezing a rebel in his fortune even—would strengthen the weakened faith in our success—in our right to success, entertained by our European friends.

Jeff. Davis's Presidential Message is republished in full in the Parisian journals of the day. It is recognized as "an able State paper." It has not the word slave or slavery in it. That absence is remarked upon here. Will *our* President have the courage to use those dread words? When shall we come to have the "courage of our opinions," as the French say?

THE IMPRISONMENT OF REV. GEORGE GORDON.

MEETING OF SYMPATHY IN CLEVELAND.

From The Cleveland Leader.

ON Sabbath morning, at divine service, the pastor of the 1st Congregational Church, West Side, Rev. J. A. Thome, called the attention of the people assembled to the imprisonment in the County jail of the Rev. George Gordon, and proposed that a meeting be held in the evening to take note of this case and to give such expression of views as might seem proper. An invitation was extended to Rev. Mr. Cormac of the 3d Baptist Church to be present.

In response to this call the church was filled with an audience composed of members of several congregations, and other citizens, interested in the occasion.

After the usual religious services, Mr. Thome read in the 12th chapter of the Acts the account of the imprisonment of Peter by Herod, and of his rescue by the angel of the Lord in answer to the prayer of the Church at Jerusalem, and of the subsequent horrible death of Herod. Without remarking on the portion of Scripture, Mr. Thome greeted the large assembly with expressions of gratification that so many of his fellow-citizens and Christian friends of different Churches had manifested their hearty interest in the case in hand by coming together. He spoke of the pride with which the citizens of Cleveland had formerly boasted that their city was the metropolis of the anti-slavery Reserve, and that a fugitive slave could not be taken back to bondage from their streets. But the people had been humbled by a series of pro-slavery acts in the midst of this goodly city, and in the high places thereof, commencing with the imprisonment of the Oberlin and Wellington Rescuers, culminating in the seizure and rendition of the slave Lucy, and ending with the incarceration of Rev. George Gordon in the common jail.

Mr. Thome read from Mr. Gordon's statement, made before the Court after the rendering of the verdict, the facts relative to his personal participation in the obnoxious affair at Iberia; and then presented for deliberation and action the following

PAPER.

The Church and congregation being called together to take into consideration

rance of a case which, had due publicity been given to it, would have excited general interest, and called forth in every quarter expressions of censure and of sympathy. We have never known an instance of more inexcusable recreancy to a sacred trust on the part of our usually faithful and out-spoken press.

We would hereby tender to the Rev. Mr. Gordon and his devoted wife our Christian sympathy, and assure them of our earnest prayers and indefatigable efforts to secure his speedy release from an unrighteous imprisonment, and disproportionate and impoverishing fine.

May the God of Joseph, of Peter, of Paul and Silas be with him in his prison cell, and give him songs in the night, and timely deliverance.

The reading of the paper was followed by an address from Rev. Mr. Cormac, glowing with sympathy for the prisoner, and indignation at the judicial wrongs inflicted upon a good and godly man.

On motion that the meeting approve of the sentiments of the paper, the people generally rose to their feet, and the motion passed without dissent.

It was further moved that the proceedings be presented to Rev. Mr. Gordon, and offered to the city press for publication.

National Anti-Slavery Standard.

WITHOUT CONCEALMENT—WITHOUT COMPROMISE.

NEW YORK, SATURDAY, JANUARY 4, 1862.

CORRESPONDENTS will greatly oblige us by a careful observance of the following directions, viz.:

Letters enclosing matter for publication, or relating in any way to the editorial conduct of the paper, should be addressed, "EDITOR OF THE ANTI-SLAVERY STANDARD, No. 5 BEEKMAN STREET, NEW YORK."

Letters enclosing subscriptions, or relating in any way to the business of the office, should be addressed, "PUBLISHER OF THE ANTI-SLAVERY STANDARD, No. 5 BEEKMAN STREET, NEW YORK."

WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON will deliver a Lecture on "THE ABOLITIONISTS, AND THEIR RELATIONS TO THE WAR," in the Cooper Institute, on TUESDAY EVENING, Jan. 14th (not the 7th, as announced last week). 1862. We are sure that all earnest friends of freedom, of whatever sect, party or class, will gladly embrace an opportunity to listen to the counsels of the man out of whose mind and heart the Anti-Slavery Movement of our time was born, and who for more than thirty years has been its foremost exponent and champion. Friends of the slave! let us fill the spacious hall and give him an enthusiastic welcome!

ENGLAND AND AMERICA.

THE issue of the Mason and Slidell difficulty has been what we intimated last week it probably would be. Mr. Seward has settled the question, on the ground that the technical irregularity of Capt. Wilkes in not sending the Trent in for trial before a prize-court vitiated the whole transaction and entitled the persons seized to be given up to England, if she chose to take advantage of it. This we hold to be strictly correct, and we believe the country at large will sustain the decision, though it will be very much against the grain. It is as if these men were indicted for an act of treason committed in Virginia, while the indictment erroneously set forth that it was done in Maryland. If the error were not discovered in season for amendment, the culprits would be entitled to their acquittal, however patent their guilt. For it is better that a guilty man should escape punishment, through the carelessness of the responsible prosecutor, than that an innocent man should be liable to be tried for an offence committed in a different place from that laid down in the indictment, and which he might not be prepared to meet. So, if the English government is willing to avail itself of the flaw in the proceedings arising from the good-natured blunder of a gallant sailor not studied in such legal niceties, there is nothing for it but to surrender the men with the best grace we can. And this, it seems to us (though not inclined in general to excessive praise of the Secretary of State), Mr. Seward has done. His letter to Mr. Adams, contemporaneous with the arrest of the rebels, and long before any news of the storm raised in England by the event had arrived or was even anticipated, shows that the decision of the question was entirely on its legal merits, and entirely uninfluenced by that blusterous explosion of popular rage. It was an act of pure reason and strict law, and its acceptance by a high-spirited nation as such, though contrary to popular prejudice and passion, is one of the most honorable passages in our history. For we deem that nothing is clearer than that the great majority in the North were disappointed at the decision, and would have readily tendered to England the wager of battle on this quarrel, if she had chosen to take it up.

We cannot hope, however, that it will be received in any such sense in England. The feeling the news will excite there, we fear, will be that of disappointment that the opportunity of breaking the blockade and opening the cotton-ports has passed away for this time. The same spirit that has influenced the course of the English press, with a few most honorable exceptions, in its unscrupulous and malignant partisanship with the rebel States, and its vituperative and lying hostility to the United States, will be swift to represent this action of the government as a cowardly submission to a threat of war. Every stimulus that talent and malignity can devise to arouse the passions of hatred and contempt towards us will be applied. *The Times*, *The Saturday Review* and *Punch* will

"Dart the quick taunt and edge the piercing gibe,"

with brisker air than ever. America will be depicted as throwing herself prostrate at the feet of Britain in terror of her arms, instead of deciding against herself, on a paltry quibble, a question where she was substantially in the right, rather than be even technically in the wrong in a national controversy. From the general tone of the press (with all honor to the honorable exceptions referred to), and from the general tone of English talk, according to the almost universal testimony of Americans now or recently abroad, we think it clear that the current of public sentiment there is against us and in favor of the South. If we needed confirmation of the fact, we should surely find it in the late letters of our esteemed English Correspondent. When she, whom we have always regarded as the very *prosopopœia* of philosophic equanimity, is dragged from her Northern moorings and drawn so strongly towards the Southern coast, we may judge of the strength of the tide which is running in that direction. We are sure that her imperturbable good humor will pardon us if we say that we could not but regard portions of her letter of the 2d of December in a comic as well as a sad point of view. The thoroughness of the John Bullism which assumes that England is necessarily in the right and America in the wrong, throughout, though not without its respectable side, threw a gleam of cheerfulness across the melancholy waste through which her prophetic gaze beheld our future to lie. The assumption of the impeccable nature of the British government and of the irresistible power of the British empire, while it excited no resentment in our breast, could not but bring a smile to our lips, which we are sure she is cosmopolitan enough yet to forgive.

"The temper and manners of the Northern people towards England!" for example. "The bullying spirit and intolerable manners" of our government. "The long course of forbearance, allowance and forgiveness on the part of England," and more to the same effect, show how a popular epidemic can carry away even a sensible and well-balanced mind, or at least can distort a mental vision usually clear beyond the common. On this side the ocean, we have not been able to discern the forbearance of the British government, nor have we been able to perceive that the bullying spirit and bad manners even of *The Herald* could compare in ill-breeding, violence and coarseness with *The Times*, and many other prominent English newspapers. The eagerness with which the English government sprung forward to recognize the rebel States as a belligerent power, surely, was as gross an insult and as grave an injury as was ever offered to a great nation arming itself to put down an insurrection. Forbearance, allowance and forgiveness, it seems to us, have been much more the badge of our tribe than of our Correspondent's. The exultation with which our disasters have been welcomed in England, and the disparagement which has been thrown upon our successes, show the temper and spirit of the nation, while the swiftness of the government to make a cause of quarrel out of this irregularity of Capt. Wilkes's in favor of its own subjects, shows that the government is not unfit to be at its head. We think that we can assure our Correspondent that very few in America share in her opinion of the consequences of a war with England. We are vain enough to think ourselves full her match on land, and that we could soon be so on sea. The population of the Northern States is equal to that of England, and the estimate of their wealth from official returns greater, though more divided, and their daily earnings more. We have now twice as many men on foot as England ever had at one time, and the reserve is almost without limit. Massachusetts, for example, has sent 27,000 men to the war out of a population of a million. Eighty years ago she furnished 58,000 out of a population of less than 300,000. Of course, she could more easily supply 100,000 men now than 50,000 then. And so of all the rest. And if our Correspondent will read the report of the Secretary of the Navy and the Letter of Mr. Donald McKay to the London *Star and Dial*, about the beginning of this month, she will see that we are not now helpless, and that we can soon indefinitely increase our force. We look upon England as in quite as great danger of invasion from the Isle of Man or Guernsey as we are from Canada or the Confederate States, even with the help of England. And we are assured that in the devilish work of doing one another mischief we should not come off second best.

Perhaps we have said too much on a subject which we have seldom dwelt much upon, and which we should have avoided now if it had not been for what fell from a person justly supposed to be unusually well-informed on American matters. If she is so behind the time in knowledge of the condition of the Northern States, what must be the darkness of the general public? The true friends of peace in England should try to inform the nation of our strength, and not to take our military and naval weakness for granted. We do not believe that the English people desire such a war with us, as one now begun would surely be, a Carthagenian and Roman war. But we do imagine that there is a large class who think that the power of Great Britain is so overwhelming that it could settle this quarrel of ours in a month or two, and open the Southern ports to imports and exports. It is the ignorance, which our excellent Dublin Correspondent admits, prevailing as to our country and its resources, and the relative importance of its various sections, that is answerable for this state of mind. Nothing can well exceed it. But the general English mind, though it knows little of our geography or statistics, has a clear notion that the chief of the cotton they use in their mills comes from this country, and that there used to be a large market for English goods here which has now been greatly cut off. Great numbers of persons feel the effects of these derangements in their pockets, and still more have a fearful looking-for of such. And all this because of a senseless *row* between two sorts of Yankees, and a horrible tariff, invented by one Morrill expressly to damage England! A recognition of the Confederacy and the breaking of the blockade would be an easy way of curing all these ills in a brief time and with small trouble. We fear that this late action of our government may be twisted from its real character, and made to appear a confession of weakness before a superior power, instead of a magnanimous reparation of a technical error, and a strong effort made to compel such an interference in our affairs. War would be the unavoidable consequence. A war which might endanger the cause, certainly the progress, of Constitutional government all over the world. A war which would be one of the longest and bloodiest of modern times, and of the calamities of which the only compensation would be the certain emancipation of the Southern slaves by their own right arms, or by those of the belligerent Powers.

FOREBODINGS.

WHAT an amazing spectacle does our country present to the eye of an intelligent appreciator of true freedom and true religion! The word LIBERTY has been so long "taken in vain," in the mouth of a slaveholding nation, that we have failed even to perceive the discrepancy, the glaring self-contradiction between our language and our lives, even when it was most offensively prominent in the sight of all other civilized nations. Our talk, in the Northern States, about "freedom and independence," has differed only in degree, not in kind, from the sublime impudence of Virginia, practising a tyranny at once the intensest and the meanest, while the device and the motto on her shield imprecate destruction on the heads of tyrants. We have sinned like Saul, in direct and open complicity with the persecutors of the saints, without making even a beginning of that repentance and reformation by which Paul afterwards distinguished himself.

Our nation has claimed to be divided into slave States and free States; but, while the former have been truly and heartily devoted to slavery, the latter have *not* been so devoted to freedom. It was long ago settled by South Carolina, at the expense of Mr. Hoar and of Massachusetts, that neither the Constitution, the laws nor the courts, were to be appealed to *against* slavery. It was settled, still longer ago, by the usage of all the slave States, that the lover of liberty who chanced to travel there was to relinquish, for the time, that freedom of speech and the press which all classes were all the time assuming to be one of the most actual, precious and inviolable of our possessions. At the South, every editor was the firm and zealous advocate of slavery. If, at the North, every editor had been the firm and zealous advocate of freedom, ours troubles would never have reached their present pitch. But such manliness was the rare exception, not the general rule; and the majority of Northern conductors of the press chose to say nothing about slavery except when they condemned the Abolitionists. Sad and long experience has amply shown slavery to be national, freedom only sectional, among us.

Until the present year, however, it has been possible for the Abolitionist to indulge one charitable hope in regard to the character of his Northern fellow-citizens. It is the nature and habit of men to acquiesce in the thing that seems *established*, even when they recognize it as an evil. It might be that those in the North and West who held such fatal complicity with slaveholders did so, not from love of slavery, but from sheer despair of effecting its overthrow. It might be that their reasoning was—Since purity is absolutely hopeless, let us at least have peace! A grave error, indeed, but one proceeding from the head rather than the heart. This amount of charitable construction has, until now, been possible. Having been educated in superstitious reverence for the Constitution, the Republicans might have been judged sincerely to believe, and sincerely to regret, that they were bound in its pro-slavery compromises.

Had this charitable theory been the true one, we should have seen the blessed, the providential opportunity offered to our government by the existence of a state of war forced upon it by the Slave Power, eagerly embraced and turned to practical account. No doubt the Constitution was a chain and a yoke to those who servilely bent under it. But when the existing fact of war caused martial law to take the place of Constitutional law, when civil judges were superseded by military officers, and the President, rightly deeming the nation of more consequence than the Constitution, took upon himself functions, and inaugurated a course of action, wholly unauthorized by that document, why could not the new authorities use this providential license against slavery, the cause, as well as against rebellion, the effect? Having gained an official right to make direct assault upon this accursed thing, why did they not proceed to act as promptly and vigorously against it as Samuel did against Agag, or as the Hebrew chief against Achan, his Babylonish garment and his wedge of gold? The first moment of that precious opportunity should have been seized to do *all that could be done* against slavery. It should have been abolished by proclamation, among the very first of the extra-constitutional acts of the Presidential Commander-in-Chief. That he did not then do it shows that he did not *wish* to do it. And his whole course since that time shows with yet greater clearness that his error is of the heart as well as of the head.

If that President who, to the disgrace of the Republican party, was selected as their candidate for his conservatism, for his indisposition to thorough reform, for his devotion to custom and precedent—if *he* had taken the energetic step of using the war power at once against slavery, his whole party and half the remainder of the Northern people would have echoed and supported him. He had a clean bill of political health to start with; an untarnished record of perfect freedom from the taint of "radicalism." Whatever *he* did against slavery would have been looked upon as indispensable to the welfare of the republic, and supported as such. And what a solid array of reasons might have been brought to demonstrate that the action thus taken *was* indispensable! How might the Secretary of State have wielded with new effect his discarded weapon, and shown incontrovertibly that the conflict between slavery and freedom was indeed "irrepressible," and that time and labor were most effectually saved by striking at once to the heart of such an enemy!

They would not do it. And since they have followed up this neglect of their first and best opportunity by interfering with the policy and nullifying the acts of those subordinate officers who saw opposition to slavery to be *their* wisdom and duty, it is scarcely to be expected that they should do better in future emergencies. The stone which their folly rejected will be used by other hands, and made the head of the corner, raising another set of men to be rulers of the destiny of this people, if, indeed, we escape the tendency to military despotism which a long continuance of war inevitably brings. And, even in the amended policy of the party next coming to be dominant (if our next President shall really be elected by the people), we shall have new proof of the deterioration wrought by slavery in the head and heart, the common sense and moral sense of the nation.

Even Butler, Fremont, Cameron and Dickinson propose to interfere with slavery only so far as military necessity may require, only so far as the present position of the rebels may be damaged by such interference, without apparently a thought either of the rights and interests of the slave himself, or of the unspeakable importance to us of removing this perpetually disturbing element from the very possibility of again mixing itself with "free institutions." Theirs is only a plan to promote the convenience and prosperity of white men. Their policy is unalloyed by any mixture of justice, generosity or humanity to the colored people. The slaves of loyal people are still to be secured to them by the whole power of the government. The slaves of rebels are still to be treated as chattels, taken possession of by the government for military purposes, and used for any exigency, just as mules or oxen might be used, and with as little thought of the present or ultimate concession of any rights inherently belonging to them as men. And at the end of the war, or when their services shall no longer be needed, it is assumed that their status is to be settled by some other power for them, not at all by themselves for themselves.

If even this is an advance upon the policy of the Republican administration, if even this moderate approach towards effectiveness in the treatment of the rebellion is opposed and counteracted by the President, for fear it should infringe too strongly on the "peculiar institution," and if the people allow even this slight forward movement to fail for want of their manifested approbation and support, what hope is there for the future, either the immediate or the ultimate future, of our nation? Even if the actual relation of slaveholder and slave should, by some merciful dispensation of Providence, be brought to an end, what must be the fate of a nation whose leaders and whose masses unite in ignoring the rights of a human being in a black skin, in banishing him from even the chance of competition with them, in still assuming the right to dispose of him as their own convenience or caprice may dictate!

It has become the settled habit of the mass of our population, as well as of the leaders of our political parties, to speak of the dark race as an essentially inferior people, a people from whom progress is not to be expected, a people who are to be governed, instead of sharing with us the duties and responsibilities of *self*-government. We talk about what is "to be done with them," refusing to recognize their natural right to decide and act for themselves, under laws contemplating their rights and interests equally with ours. We talk, with an arrogance which would appear insufferable if used towards any white people, of finding a place in which to colonize these men and women, native Americans equally with ourselves, without asking or caring what their wish may be in the premises. This habit of thinking, speaking and acting, in a manner intensely unjust and cruel in all things pertaining to this dark people, has become chronic among us; and the prejudice [illegible] which we regard them has come, by long custom, to seem natural right, and unconquerable, to a very large proportion of our Northern people.

The religious sentiment of the country (as far as it is represented by the large and popular sects), instead of opposing this wicked prejudice, has been its strongest ally and advocate. Instead of giving the negro a refuge in the Church against the injustice of the unregenerate world, it copies that injustice in the very house of worship, preaches and publishes an elaborate vindication of it from the Bible, and actually builds up, in its Churches at home, called Christian, a system of caste no better than that which its missionaries denounce in India as one of the most pernicious vices of heathenism.

Holding ideas like these, living in accordance with them, and impudently pretending them to be perfectly consistent with Democratic Freedom in the State, and with Christianity in the Church, what is our prospect for the future, even apart from the yet undecided result of a gigantic rebellion? Could we possibly build up a permanently prosperous State, and a really Christian Church, until this central, radical vice is removed? While a just God holds the throne of the universe, can we possibly attain welfare and prosperity, material or spiritual, continuing to hold a lie in our right hand?

For the guilty, nation or individual, the path of progress *must* lie through the valley of humiliation. Unless we are wise enough to seek it, it must be forced upon us. Our wickedness has been like that of Egypt, like that of Babylon. It yet remains to be seen whether our ruin is to be complete, like theirs! whether we are worth saving! whether utter destruction or a long course of purgatorial trial is to be our destiny! God help us, President and people, to repent while there is yet time!

MR. TILTON'S LECTURE, on "The Latest Questions of the War," delivered at the Cooper Institute on Thursday evening of last week, gave great satisfaction to those who heard it. The audience, owing to various unpropitious circumstances, was not numerous, though highly intelligent. The speaker made it clear that the only way of speedily crushing the rebellion is to sweep away its cause.

Mr. Tilton, in commencing his lecture, said: "The lesson of the hour is the freedom of the slave. Better fitted than I to teach it, was the man who stood here a week ago; I mean Wendell Phillips (applause). Better fitted than I to teach it, will be the man who is to stand here a few weeks hence; I mean William Lloyd Garrison (applause). As to myself, I have somehow drifted in between them, like a cock-boat between the Pillars of Hercules" (laughter).

—Mr. Garrison will speak on the 14th inst. upon "The Abolitionists, and their Relations to the War."

MR. PHILLIPS'S SPEECH ON THE WAR.—We are late in printing this speech, but our readers will be more than compensated for the delay in the fact that our report embraces the author's latest corrections. As it now stands, we believe it will afford the utmost satisfaction to Mr. Phillips's friends, ranking among the best examples of his peculiar style of argument and eloquence.

OUR LONDON CORRESPONDENT is entitled to special thanks for his timely letters. He is a true Englishman, but in spite of surrounding excitement, his head is cool, his judgment unimpaired. We have received a fresh letter at the moment of going to press, for which our readers must wait till next week.

THE SURRENDER OF MASON AND SLIDELL.

THE correspondence between the British government and the State Department at Washington, ending with the surrender of the rebel Commissioners by the latter to the former, would fill a page of this paper—an amount of space which we so pressingly need for other purposes that we must refer our readers who wish to see it to other journals; contenting ourselves with simply stating its substance.

In the first place, it is to be noted that Mr. Seward, on Nov. 30—the very day when Earl Russell was preparing his demand for the surrender of Mason and Slidell—addressed a letter to Mr. Adams, American Minister at London, to be communicated to the British Cabinet, in which he states that "Capt. Wilkes having acted without any instructions from the government, the subject is therefore free from the embarrassment which might have resulted if the act had been specially directed by us"; and expresses the hope that the British government will consider the subject in a friendly temper. This letter, received in England at the very time of the arrival of the British demand at Washington, must have served to mollify somewhat the war-fever in that country.

Earl Russell, in a note to Lord Lyons, British minister at Washington, after reciting the account of the seizure received from the British mail agent on board the Trent, characterizes it as "an act of violence which was an affront to the British flag and a violation of international law," expresses a willingness to believe that Capt. Wilkes was acting without any authority from the American government, or under a misunderstanding of his instructions, and an unwillingness to believe "that it could be the deliberate intention of the government of the United States unnecessarily to force into discussion between the two governments a question of so grave a character, and with regard to which the whole British nation would be sure to entertain such unanimity of feeling." Earl Russell trusts that the American government will, of its own accord, offer such redress as alone could satisfy the British nation, namely: "The liberation of the four gentlemen and their delivery to your Lordship, in order that they may again be placed under British protection, and a suitable apology for the aggression which has been committed." He says in conclusion, "Should these terms not be offered by Mr. Seward, you will propose them to him."

Mr. Seward replies at great length, stating the American view of the matter, founded upon the official statements of Capt. Wilkes and others, and discussing the question in all its aspects in the light of international law. He thinks Lord Lyons will perceive that the case, instead of presenting a merely flagrant act of violence on the part of Capt. Wilkes, was undertaken as a simple, legal, and customary belligerent proceeding. He shows that Mason and Slidell and their dispatches were contraband of war; that Capt. Wilkes had a right to stop and search the Trent for the contraband persons and dispatches, and that he exercised that right in a lawful and proper manner. But he admits that Capt. Wilkes "sacrificed the right of his government to the custody and disposition of the captured persons" by failing to bring the vessel into port and thereby "preventing the judicial examination which otherwise might have occurred." The capture "was left unfinished, or was abandoned," and the release being voluntary, "involved a waiver of the claim of this government to hold the captured persons." In coming to this conclusion he regards himself as "really defending and maintaining, not an exclusively British interest, but an old, honored, and cherished American cause, not upon British authorities, but upon principles that constitute a large portion of the distinctive policy by which the United States have developed the resources of a continent, and, thus becoming a considerable maritime power, have won the respect and confidence of many nations." And he quotes by way of proof the language employed in 1804 by James Madison, then Secretary of State under Jefferson, in instructions to James Monroe, our Minister to England—language conveying in the strongest terms the idea that persons contraband of war cannot be justly captured and retained without judicial trial. Mr. Seward thereupon says:

"If I decide this case in favor of my own government, I must disavow its most cherished principles, and reverse and forever abandon its essential policy. The country cannot afford the sacrifice. If I maintain those principles and adhere to that policy, I must surrender the case itself. It will be seen, therefore, that this government could not deny the justice of the claim presented to us in this respect upon its merits. We are asked to do to the British nation just what we have always insisted all nations ought to do to us.

"The claim of the British government is not made in a discourteous manner. This government, since its first organization, has never used more guarded language in a similar case.

"In coming to my conclusion, I have not forgotten that if the safety of this Union required the detention of the captured persons it would be the right and duty of this government to detain them. But the effectual check and waning proportions of the existing insurrection, as well as the comparative unimportance of the captured persons themselves, when dispassionately weighed, happily forbid me from resorting to that defence.

"Nor have I been tempted at all by suggestions that cases might be found in history where Great Britain refused to yield to other nations, and even to ourselves, claims like that which is now before us. Those cases occurred when Great Britain, as well as the United States, was the home of [illegible] which, with all their peculiar interests and passions, have passed away. She could in no other way [illegible] effectually disarm [illegible] as she does by [illegible] now as her own the ground upon which we then stood. It would tell little for our own claims to the character of a just and magnanimous people, if we should so far consent to be guided by the law of retaliation as to lift up buried injuries from their grave to oppose against what national consistency and the national conscience compel us to regard as a claim intrinsically right.

"Putting behind me all suggestions of this kind, I prefer to express my satisfaction that, by the adjustment of the present case, upon principles confessedly American, and yet, as I trust, mutually satisfactory to both of the nations concerned, a question is finally and rightly settled between them which, heretofore exhausting not only all forms of peaceful discussion, but also the arbitrament of war itself, for more than half a century alienated the two countries from each other, and perplexed with fears and apprehensions all other nations.

"The four persons in question are now held in military custody at Fort Warren, in the State of Massachusetts. *They will be cheerfully liberated. Your Lordship will please indicate a time and place for receiving them.*"

It is announced that the rebel Commissioners and their Secretaries will go to England in the steamer Niagara, which leaves on Wednesday next.

We ought to add that the British view of the case was strongly supported in a special dispatch from Thouvenel, the French Minister of Foreign Affairs.

MRS. MARTINEAU'S RECENT LETTERS.

WE do not feel at liberty to suppress the following article, written by one of the most intelligent and devoted Abolitionists of this country, and expressing, as we have reason to believe, the sentiments and feelings of many of our readers.—ED. STANDARD.

To the Editor of The National Anti-Slavery Standard.

YOUR journal, and the great imperishable cause of Justice and Freedom which it represents, have no reason to fear the most ample discussion, or the sternest criticism of friend or foe. Indeed, it has been the glory of the anti-slavery cause, from its birth, that it has given every facility, in its publications and on its platform, to freedom of discussion in its best sense—that it has invited it, and courted it, in the perfect assurance that error and wrong would be soonest and surest neutralized and overcome, when no bars or barriers were placed in the way of the all-conquering power of the truth. While this principle is maintained, no essential harm can happen to the cause; when it is violated, the real contest will be shifted to some other and freer spot, and will be maintained by other and freer hands.

It is in the support of this principle, and in the exercise of the right which it confers, that I feel moved to say, in your columns, that I have never known the great principle of free discussion, among friends of a common cause, put to a severer test than it has recently been by your English correspondent, H. M., and particularly in her letter which appeared in your paper of December 28th. It is a severe trial of friendship and mutual respect, when one party (from any cause) assumes an attitude of superiority, and deals out lessons, rebukes and judicial censures, to the other party; nor is the trial lessened in any measure when the one assumes to speak for a whole nation (for which nearly every virtue is claimed), and to adjudge and doom another nation, in whose behalf not one mitigating circumstance, it is alleged, can be urged to save it from the scorn of the world. When it is remembered that language like this comes to the United States from England, whose path over the world has been reddened with blood and made fearful by merciless oppressions, far faster than the hands of its later coming missionaries of good-will could heal the wounds, or wipe the tears, the astonishment and the sense of wrong with which we read are not a little heightened. When it is remembered, again, how often our American merchantmen have been *brought to* by "shotted guns across their bows" from British cruisers, and that the instances have not been few in which overbearing insolence and "intolerable manners" have marked the behavior of the British officers towards those upon whose decks they came—behavior for which apologies were necessarily forthcoming from the British government—it is marvellous, indeed, to read such language as the following from the pen of H. M.: "When Commander Wilkes ordered the seizure of the Southern gentlemen on board the Trent [how suddenly these men-stealers have become *gentlemen* in H. M.'s eyes!], *he simply ruined his country*"! We must of course, I suppose, accept our ruin, pronounced thus magisterially and loftily; but we had not before known the high commission held by H. M., or any other foreign writer, thus to doom us! Considering how long a line of precedents for Capt. Wilkes's act can be found in British naval practice—precedents attended with aggravations which Capt. Wilkes sought to avoid—the language and style become peculiarly offensive.

According to H. M., England will declare war upon the United States, because of an act which we believe to be warranted and sanctioned by her own example—unless that act be disavowed by us, and reparation made. H. M. *admits* that the course of England, in making such a war upon us, will be "the salvation of slavery"; and she justifies as necessary the war, which is thus about to *save* and strengthen and perpetuate slavery, while no retribution and no denunciation are heavy enough for the United States government because it has not yet avowed a purpose to overthrow and *destroy* slavery! She is right in one thing. If England, in the present circumstances, declares war against the United States, it will be *in the interest of slavery*. No protestations to the contrary can save her from that verdict. It will be to war upon those who may, indeed, in the matter of slavery, be but half right, but in favor of those who, on the same subject, are wholly wrong, and whom she (England) knows to be utterly, vilely and cruelly wrong. And even should the war be averted, through the readiness of our government to yield to England, in the circumstances, more than England had a right to demand, yet will it not be forgotten that England made that demand in the moment of our sore trial, and with a haste and bitterness which must stamp it forever, in the eyes of all impartial observers, as dishonorable and thoroughly inimical to our people. The temper and conceit which would allow a writer of her nation to pronounce sentence upon the United States, as about to be an "outlaw among the nations"—unsuitable company, that is, for the other existing powers of the world—are somewhat too strong and distasteful to be commented upon. Let H. M. feel that she has contributed her full part towards widening the breach between America and England, which she declares to be already so great; and be sure that hereafter the number will be small here with whom her opinions and suggestions will have any weight.

From such imperious criticism, we turn with pleasure to remember the manner in which Wm. E. Forster, Thomas Hughes, the Duke of Argyll and John Bright, have spoken of America in this hour of her trial. Magnanimous in their thoughts and utterances, we doubt not that England has others like them. We wish our own government had a higher, juster, nobler policy. We live and labor in the faith that the people will yet demand and inaugurate such a policy. However that may be, we shall look on, with what calmness we may, to see *England*, for selfish greed of cotton and of trade, stretch out the right hand of fellowship to "slavery, the sum of all villanies." S. M.

LETTER FROM AARON M. POWELL.

POUGHKEEPSIE, N. Y., Dec. 30, 1861.

To the Editor of The National Anti-Slavery Standard.

AFTER several months of rest from speaking, I have been engaged, for three weeks past, in holding a series of meetings in the valley of the Hudson. I noted in the outset a marked change in the attitude of the listeners—I mean on the part of those who have heretofore given us audience but never have been heartily in sympathy with the Anti-Slavery movement. Before the outbreak of the rebellion they listened (if they were not mobocrats, as last winter), but with an incredulous air which seemed to say, "You are but impracticable, fanatical abolitionists." Now, with such, there seems to be a more hearty interest, and a stronger feeling of fellowship. Except among those who are nearest the official Washington influence, the response is hearty and earnest to the anti-slavery sentiment, enunciated a quarter of a century ago, viz: "*That the slaves ought to be immediately set free, and brought under the protection of law.*" With one or two exceptions, the meetings have been well attended. While in Ulster County I was very efficiently aided in my work, and most hospitably entertained by Mr. Morris Deponai and family, of Ellenville, also Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Foster, of Greenfield, to all of whom I would render grateful acknowledgments. Mr. Deponai is a German refugee, of cultivated mind, and keen sense of right, a revolutionist engaged with General Sigel and others, now in the Federal army, in the Revolution of '49, and obliged to flee, first to Switzerland, thence to this country. His sympathies are strongly enlisted with the oppressed of this country. Detesting the rebels, he is kept from the Federal ranks by the gratuitously pro-slavery policy, and consequent suicidal military management of the President and his subordinates.

Mr. and Mrs. Foster are from England, where he was a Methodist minister. He continued to preach for a time in that capacity after coming to this country, but for conscience sake was subsequently led to renounce his connection with the pro-slavery Methodist Episcopal Church, in which action he was heartly seconded by his wife. They are among the *extremely few* exceptions to be made in favor of the English people who have *not*, on coming to this country, with its peculiar pro-slavery temptations, shown themselves to be as conscienceless as the rank and file of Americans.

Petitions for the abolition of slavery under the "War Power" receive considerable numbers of signatures in every community where they are offered. But they are not as unanimously signed as we were led to expect, either with or without the proposition for compensation to loyal masters, which is a part of the memorial issued through THE STANDARD. While I like the benevolent motive of the compensation proposition, disclaiming the right of property in man, to facilitate an amicable adjustment of difficulties—and in a benevolent point of view, should like it much better if it included also the plundered and helpless victims of the slave-masters—I confess to an insurmountable difficulty in advocating and recommending it. My conviction is that the so-called loyal slave-owners are really the most damaging and expensive enemies the Federal government has. They consent to remain loyal so long as they are able to dictate a pro-slavery policy on the part of the government towards the rebellion. In doing this, they are practically, if not intentionally, the most efficient allies Jeff. Davis could possibly have. Who shall say that it is not a masterly, diplomatic part of the rebel programme for the destruction or the subjugation of the Federal government? In the eye of justice they are, as slave-owners and slave-breeders, men-stealers and criminals, deserving of punishment and discipline for their infringement of the laws of justice and humanity. Add to this the aid, comfort, and practical advantage they give the rebels by dictating the suicidal policy upon which the Federal government is now administered, and the *unconditional, uncompensated surrender of slavery* is not the half of the demand that justice makes, and, therefore, that the North should make and execute upon them.

For two Sundays past I have spoken upon slavery and the war to the Rev. Mr. Cutting's congregation—Unitarian-Universalist—in this city, and have had a very good and satisfactory hearing. Mr. Cutting is an earnest, outspoken advocate of the anti-slavery cause, and is exerting a most wholesome influence in the city. Would that there were many more like him faithful in the ministry. How morally timid and time-serving the clergymen of this country, as a body, are shown to be in this crisis! To be sure, many have taken to the position of chaplains in the army, but the cause of freedom still suffers in want of that higher courage they might have shown, and an increased usefulness they might have rendered by being truthful in the pulpit at home. As in war there is no Sunday, so it would seem with many clergymen there is no God, other than the President, and accordingly their position must be carefully adjusted to his, right or wrong. There are, of course, not a few noble and praiseworthy exceptions in the pulpit, which speak for themselves.

Nobleness of purpose, righteous and definite, to result in right action, is a popular necessity, which Abolitionists must now, as heretofore, endeavor faithfully to meet and contribute to. To them the nation is most indebted for whatever measure of moral vigor it has. May their influence for good be yet more potent and extended. AARON M. POWELL.

Our Washington Correspondence.

WASHINGTON, Dec. 30, 1861.

THE Treasury Department is, if possible, in greater trouble just now than the State Department. Without money the government will find it exceedingly difficult to carry on the war much longer, and the fact is, that if the war had been prosecuted more vigorously, there would now be no trouble in obtaining money. The do-nothing policy has been pursued until the government is almost at its wit's end. The rebels are not starved. They are not annihilated by our "masterly inactivity." Certain members of the government have all summer been certain that the way-still policy was by far the best for the army to adopt, under the mistaken idea that it was possible to *starve* the rebels into submission, when the simple fact is, that they must be *whipped* into it, if they are ever to be subjugated. As to our foreign trouble, Mr. Lincoln says, "it is an ugly business." That is about all he will say upon the subject, and the utterance means a great deal, doubtless, under the circumstances. But humiliating as are our foreign affairs, the troubles of the Treasury Department are of greater importance. A month more must settle the question as to the *mode* of raising money, and whether it can be raised at all or not by the ordinary mode of borrowing. The opinion gains ground rapidly here that the government will yet be forced to issue notes, making them a legal tender for the payment of debts. To go on borrowing specie at the rate of ten millions a week is a very difficult matter, as Mr. Chase has discovered already. It will be necessary to discover some other way to carry on the war.

A great success in the field, a decisive battle, would doubtless change the aspect of affairs materially. This is what Mr. Chase is waiting for, and in doing so he acts with great shrewdness. There are few men in the country who could have furnished money so long for the war on the system of borrowing. The rebel government has found out, indeed found out before it had been going a month, that it could not actually *borrow* money, but that it must *force* the people to accept its letters of credit. Its scrip being pushed upon the people of the rebellious States, for a time at least it answered all the purposes of currency, and as a final resort this government will come to the same practice.

There is not much talk in Congress about this matter as yet, there being a disposition to conceal the difficulties of the government as long as possible, in the hope that "something will turn up" before long to relieve the Treasury. But Mr. Fessenden, the Chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, and Mr. Stevens, of the Ways and Means Committee in the House, have spoken out their opinions freely. Mr. Stevens said that the government could not go on six months longer at this rate. Mr. Fessenden declared that the government would break down in less than a twelvemonth, unless there were retrenchment and economy, and successes in the field. Something *will* be done. The necessity for it has now become apparent to the President and Gen. McClellan, and every member of the government. The settlement of the Trent affair without hostilities with England, though somewhat galling to our pride, will mend matters much, but a steady advance into the heart of the enemy's country will do more.

The Report of the Investigating Committee has somewhat injured the credit of the government. It has fostered suspicions against the integrity of the members of the government, or rather of certain members of it. When men connected with the government give to their relatives jobs worth from $80,000 to $100,000, the patriot and the honest citizen may well shudder, and pause to look into the future thoughtfully. There has been a too strong disposition on the part of certain gentlemen connected with the government to aid their friends even at the expense of the Treasury of the United States. Dishonest contractors have been patted on the back by some of the most prominent men of the country. Cabinet officers have been familiar with gigantic thieves. Yet in most of these cases of a lax virtue, a carelessness of one's reputation, there has been no deliberate connivance at fraud, no intelligent attempt to aid political friends or family relations. It has been through the want of an honest education in these matters. A large proportion of our public men are brought up with the loosest of notions respecting their conduct as politicians and legislators. The result of this dishonest handling of the people's money is the threatened ruin of the country. No government can long go on borrowing while there is a lack of confidence in the honesty of the members of that government. Mr. Chase can do a great deal, but he cannot carry an entire Administration upon his shoulders. His own honesty will go a great way, but not far enough to cover everybody connected with the government, unless there is reform. But the agitation of this question will do good, and has already done good. It will be up in Congress for discussion, and all the facts alluded to by the Committee will be brought prominently before the country. We must have retrenchment, reform, economy of the most rigid kind in the public expenditures, *and a speedy advance upon the enemy.* With further peculations at the Departments, with careless expenditures, and a do-nothing policy, all is lost, and *separation is inevitable.* England and France are becoming impatient of our delay, and will not wait much longer to open the cotton ports of the South. These, at least, are the opinions of some of our wisest men—men who are *honest* as well as wise.

The liberation of Messrs. Mason and Slidell is the great topic of the week. People generally in Washington are very indignant at the surrender of these rebels. The feeling towards England is very bitter. "We bide our time," is the remark almost everywhere, "and if England ever is encompassed with troubles, we will endeavor to remind her of her present conduct." There is no manner of doubt that the course of the British government, peers and people, towards us, throughout the rebellion and the war, will lead to an embittered state of feeling between the two peoples. Mr. Seward is very much humiliated by the demands of England and France in this affair, and the surrender of Mason and Slidell is a terrible blow to his future prospects. In making the surrender his friends say he was fully aware that the act would render him somewhat unpopular, at least for a time, among some of his best friends, and that he made the sacrifice for the sake of his country. I am inclined to think this is the fact. Mr. Welles, who was in such a hurry to thank Capt. Wilkes, must feel a little mortified, but it will teach him a lesson for the future. The fact is, this is one of our chief

another approval and disapproval, daggers and doubts, all at once. They moved their feet and struck their canes, and clapped and wanted to clap and didn't clap, all under one; and they came away, saying, some of them, "This is glorious"; others, "This is dreadful"; "Other ears should have heard it"; "O that Congress and the President could have listened"; "Shall we come to it before it is too late? Or shall we die in our sin, and the ruin of slavery and the ruin of the nation be one?"

Men here, who have been in a chronic state of wrath for a long time, at the pusillanimity, half-heartedness and point-no-point policy of the government, were ready to burst with indignation and despair, as there were unfolded to them in the lecture the terrific consequences of a protracted prosecution of the war without the purposed and sweeping overthrow of slavery.

With Dr. Cheever's clear prophetic insight, hardly short of inspiration, his grasp of principles, his dauntless courage and will, of the heroic mould, and his power of demonstration, sarcasm and rebuke, if he only had more predominant in his composition the element of hopefulness, he would carry all before him as an orator. While his successful career as a public speaker, in England and Scotland, has evidently improved his powers of oratory, his fell grapple with the Slave Power and with the pro-slavery of the American Church seems to have developed a grim energy and intensity of purpose in the indomitable Doctor, that has all the strength both of hope and despair. The audience felt it; and I doubt if a Worcester assembly were ever more *deeply* moved than last night.

Our European Correspondence.

VOICES FROM THE OLD WORLD.

From Our London Correspondent.

LONDON, December 10, 1861.

A BETTER feeling is, I trust, taking possession of the public mind in this country, than that which occupied it a week ago. Let it be known on your side, as it is well understood amongst the initiated on this, that the money of the Confederate rebels of the South has been disbursed without stint, to secure the hireling services of the venal writers for our metropolitan and provincial journals.

Long before secession was an accomplished fact, the press of England had been tampered with by the emissaries of your disunion party. Men had been industriously at work to prepare the way for the speedy recognition of the independence of the cotton States. The programme of Jefferson Davis and his co-conspirators had been made known, and arguments supplied wherewith it might be supported. Men here were already supplied with their briefs and their retaining fees. The simultaneous rising of the free States, and the improvisation of an immense army of loyal men, greatly disconcerted the machinations of Yancey, Mann, and their corrupt tools, and necessitated the adoption of a different course of action; but they are still active, and the plunder of the sub-treasuries of the South still holds out, and is freely distributed amongst those who are base enough to be the instruments of the worst of traitors and the vilest of despots.

Since I last wrote you, England has been benefitted by the timely utterances of some of our most eminent representative men.

RICHARD COBDEN has spoken, in terms calm, clear and impressive. He demands that there be a suspension of final judgment upon the question that threatens the interruption of amicable relations, until the government of Washington has been heard. He repudiates the language of those public writers who, without waiting until both parties have been heard, have given utterance to threats which, if they were supposed to emanate from the British people, must render compliance on the part of America with the requisitions of this government difficult, if not impossible. He refers to the proposal made by your Cabinet, more than five years ago, to the European Powers, to exempt private property at sea from capture by armed vessels of any kind, and pledges himself to show, on a future occasion, that no other country is interested to half the extent of England in carrying out that proposition; he will go further, and contend for the exemption from visitation, search and obstruction of every kind, all neutral merchant ships in time of war, as well as in time of peace. Finally, he entertained the strongest conviction that any act of intervention on the part of a European Power, whether by breaking the blockade, or a premature acknowledgment of the independence of the South, or in any other way, could have no other effect but to aggravate and protract the quarrel. "History tells us how greatly the horrors of the French Revolution sprung from the intervention of the foreigner. Were a similar element thrown in to infuriate the American contest, every restraining motive for forbearance, every thought of compromise, or conciliation, would be cast to the winds—the North would avail itself of the horrible weapon always ready at hand, and, by calling in the aid of the negro, would carry the fire and sword of a servile war into the South, and make it a desolation and a wilderness. So far from expecting that the raw material of our great industry would reach us sooner in consequence of such an intervention, I believe the more probable result would be the destruction of the cotton plant itself throughout the Southern States of the Union."

JOHN BRIGHT has spoken. The South is in a state of "*fearful and wicked insurrection*" The question that has given rise to the civil war is *not* the Tariff, but a more grave question—the question of slavery. The crisis that has now arrived was inevitable. The awakened conscience of the North has produced it. The public sentiment of the North is the fruit of the preaching of abolition doctrines by earnest and religious men. A great party resolved, at last, upon the restraint and control of slavery, and that it should not extend beyond its present area. The Slave Power had been predominant. The overthrow of that power by the election of Mr. Lincoln was the cause of the rebellion. The object of the South is to escape from the majority that wishes to limit the area of slavery. They wish to found a slave State, free from the influences and the opinions of freedom. The free States in the North, therefore, now stand before the world the advocates and defenders of freedom and civilization. The slave States of the South offer themselves for the recognition of Christian nations, based upon the foundation, the unchangeable foundation in their eyes, of slavery and barbarism. "I will not discuss (he says) the guilt of men who, ministers of a great nation, only last year conspired to overthrow it. I will not point to, or recapitulate the statements of the fraudulent manner in which they disposed of the funds in the national exchequer. I will not point out by name any of the men in this conspiracy, whom history will designate by titles which their children will not like to hear; but I say that slavery has sought to break up the most free government in the world, and to found a new State in this nineteenth century, whose 'cornerstone' is the perpetual bondage of millions of men." Had a rebellion broken out in Russia against the Emperor, in consequence of his noble measure for the emancipation of the serfs, "the people of England, although but seven years ago they were in mortal combat with Russia, in the south of Europe—I believe that at this moment they would have prayed Heaven with all sincerity and fervor to give strength to the arm and success to the good wishes of the Emperor, that that vile and pernicious insurrection might be suppressed." "Looking at the principles avowed in England, there is no man, not absolutely a non-resistant, who can fairly challenge the conduct of the American government in its war with the South. It is a curious thing to find that the party in this country which, on every public question, is in favor of *war* at *any price*, when it comes to speak of the duty of the government of the United States, is in favor of that government purchasing *peace* at *any price*." Let any man in this country try to restore the Heptarchy. Do you think that any minister would think it a question to be tolerated for a moment? There are many other passages which I should like to quote, but have room for no more than the peroration of the generous, enlightened and magnificent oration delivered by Mr. Bright to his admiring townsmen at Rochdale on the 4th inst.

"Before I sit down I must ask you—What is this people about of which so many men in England at this moment are writing and speaking, and thinking with harshness—I think with injustice—if not with great bitterness? Two centuries ago multitudes of the people of this country found a refuge on the North American continent, escaping from the tyranny of the Stuarts and from the bigotry of Laud. Many noble spirits from our country endeavoured to establish great experiments in favor of human freedom on that continent. Bancroft, the greatest historian of his own country, has said in his graphic and emphatic language. "The history of the colonization of America is the history of the crimes of Europe." From that time down to our own period America has admitted the wanderers from every clime. Since 1815, the time which many here remember, and which is within my lifetime, more than three million of persons have emigrated from the United Kingdom to the United States. During the fifteen years from 1845, or 1846 to 1859 or 1860—a time so recent that we all remember the most trivial circumstances and events that have happened in that time—during those fifteen years more than 2,320,000 persons left the shores of the United Kingdom as emigrants for the States of North America. At this very moment, then, there are millions in the United States who personally, or whose parents, have at one time been citizens of this country, with persons, some of the oldest of those whom I am now addressing. They subdued the wilderness. They met with plenty there which was not afforded them in their native country, and they are become a great people. There may be those persons in England who are jealous of the States. There may be men who dislike democracy, and who hate a republic. There may even be those whose sympathies warm toward the slave oligarchy of the South. But of this I am certain, that only misrepresentation the most gross, or calumny the most wicked, can sever the tie which unites the great mass of the people of this country with their friends and brethren beyond the Atlantic (applause). Whether the Union will be restored or not, or the South will achieve an unhonored independence or not, I know not, and I predict not. But this I think I know, that in a few years, a very few years, the twenty million of free men in the North will be thirty million or fifty million—a population equal to or exceeding that of this kingdom. When that time comes, I pray that it may not be said among them that in the darkest hour of their country's trials, England, the land of their fathers, looked on with icy coldness and saw unmoved the perils and the calamities of her children. As for me, I have but this to say: I am one in this audience, and but one in the citizenship of this country. But if all other tongues are silent, mine shall speak for that policy which gives hope to the bondsmen of the South, and tends to generous thoughts, and generous words, and generous deeds between the two great nations who speak the English language, and from their origin are alike entitled to the English name."

CHARLES H. SPURGEON has spoken. This deservedly popular minister of the Gospel, on Sunday morning last, preached to his congregation of five thousand persons, from the text, "Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called the children of God." The passage was chosen to afford the orator an opportunity of making special reference to the existing state of affairs between England and the United States. While fully recognizing the rights and duty of England to maintain inviolate the sacredness of her flag, as the protection of the oppressed of all nations, Mr. Spurgeon very eloquently insisted upon the necessity for calm forbearance towards a great country so intimately allied to us as yours. I shall hereafter be able to furnish you with some quotations from a discourse which rivetted the attention of the immense audience.

NEWMAN HALL, the successor of Rowland Hill and James Sherman, has spoken. He addressed three thousand persons last evening in the following language:

"*I have been astounded and grieved at the angry spirit which the news of that affair has aroused, and at the readiness with which not only many newspapers, but certain representatives of even radical constituencies, and many religious people too, have spoken of the necessity of vindicating our honor by an appeal to the sword. For consider what great things are in this little word war (hear hear). It means increased taxation, commercial disaster, dearth of employment, and dearness of food. Remember that half the taxation of the country is to pay the interest on the debt caused by war. But war with America is specially to be deprecated. Do not forget amidst the present excitement, that they with whom we talk of fighting are our kinsmen. They left these shores to develop yonder our own great principles of freedom. They are of our race—they use our literature—they speak our language—they read our Bible.*"

The address was a lengthened one, and was closed by words as full of Christian pathos as they are of manly eloquence:

"I am not one of those who condemn war under all circumstances—but I consider in this case war would be most wicked. I am not one of those who advocate peace at any price—but I do earnestly plead for peace now, and I ask you all to help. Let us each do what we can to roll back the tide of angry passion. Let us listen to the earnest pleadings which I can imagine the fair spirits of humanity, of freedom, of religion, with weeping eyes and tone trembling with emotion, are now, amidst the din of angry threats and warlike preparation, addressing our reason and our heart. Oh, by all the untold horrors of angry war—by the tenfold terribleness of a war between brothers—by the sufferings of a negro race, who look on with alarm lest you should join their oppressors to rivet their chains—by the aspirations of the long down-trodden people of Hungary and Italy, whose enemies will exult if the great champions of freedom contend with each other instead of making common cause against tyranny—by the interests of the world, which will look on aghast to see its civilizers and evangelists engaged in mortal combat instead of prosecuting, in holy rivalry, enterprises of benevolence—by the principles of Christianity—by the example of Jesus—by the law of God—I beseech you cast in your influence on the side of peace, and loudly proclaim, "We will have no war with America."

GEORGE THOMPSON has spoken. This gentleman has recently delivered upwards of twenty lectures in various parts of the country, with a view of representing the true position of the North, and the relation of the war to the Constitution, the Union, slavery, and the existence of government in the United States. Mr. Thompson is about to deliver a course of lectures at the Free Trade Hall in Manchester, which will be continued to the time of the reassembling of Parliament. The [illegible] of the origin and true causes of the civil war, the designs of the South, the history of the secession movement, the spread of anti-slavery principles, and the relations between Great Britain and America. It is probable that the same lectures will be delivered in London, Mr. Thompson travelling during the time between the metropolis and the great city of the North—the centre of cottondom. The same gentleman, at the request of Mr. Newman Hall and the members of his congregation, will lecture on "The American Crisis," in Surrey Chapel, on the 20th inst. I need not say that these lectures will be in the interest of peace, freedom and free labor, and will do justice to the sentiments and acts of those with whom Mr. Thompson has in former years labored in America.

PRAYER FOR THE PRESERVATION OF PEACE.—On Sunday it was announced from the pulpits of a large number of churches and chapels of the metropolis that on Thursday next, the 12th—being the day on which the message of the British government to that of the United States is expected to arrive at its destination—an aggregate meeting of Christians of all denominations would be held in Exeter Hall, to beseech Almighty God in His providence to guide the counsels of the two governments, and preserve to both countries the priceless blessings of peace.

I last evening attended a crowded public meeting of the electors of the Metropolitan Borough of Lambeth, attended by one of the Representatives, at which the following resolution was passed, with about ten dissentient voices:

"That this meeting, whilst recognizing the importance of maintaining the honor of the British flag untarnished, expresses the earnest hope that should difficulties arise in connection with the American question, recourse will be had to arbitration, or other means, to avert a war between England and America."

FROM OUR DUBLIN CORRESPONDENT.

I HAVE long been and still am a hearty admirer of THE STANDARD, and am quite willing to coincide, as far as I have the means of forming an opinion, with the judgment I have often seen expressed, that it is the best and most conscientious as well as one of the most able of American newspapers. But misfortune brings people into strange company, and I am sorry to find myself, in a matter of opinion, in the same boat with Jefferson Davis as opposed to that of the writer of your leader of November 29th, in THE STANDARD which this day came to hand.

I am told that the President of the piratical Southern Confederacy, in an official address lately delivered, has declared in reference to the affair of the Trent, that Messrs. Mason and Slidell might as well have been seized in the streets of London as on board a ship carrying the English Royal Mail, in charge of a representative of the Queen and sailing from one neutral port to another. On the other hand I totally differ from the approval of the act of Captain Wilkes implied in the leader to which I have referred, and which may lead to such consequences as would be involved in an international quarrel between Great Britain and the United States. As your country and your cause numbers many friends, whom I have for upwards of twenty years regarded with admiration, respect and affection, I do not feel in the least conscious of my judgment in this matter being warped by any preference of one country over another. I am not affected with that indiscriminate admiration for the English nation, or that disposition to defend all her acts, which warps the minds of so many of her own people—that tendency to adopt the maxim of "our country right or wrong" which perhaps unconsciously sways the people of every country from the line of judicial integrity. If the act of Captain Wilkes be recognized as right, there can be no safety for any country so long as there is another so pugnacious and so unprincipled as to disregard the rights of any other community disposed to put up with insult or outrage without resistance or potential remonstrance. I know of nothing which England values more, or for which she more deserves the respect of all whose respect is valuable, than the right of asylum which her flag and her soil afford to political exiles (1) of all nations, regardless of their antecedents or of the politics which they represent. The United States have always acted on the same principle on her own soil, and I cannot see what right they have to invade the exercise of this privilege in the case of England. If all the Southern leaders had fallen into your hands by the fortune of war, or in any legitimate way, no one would rejoice more heartily than I should. But Mason and Slidell are not worth what they will cost the free States (even if there should be no war) if the act of Captain Wilkes be not promptly disavowed by your government, for they will destroy that feeling of respect and confidence between the two countries without which true peace, respect and confidence cannot exist between them. If such conduct were quietly submitted to, a succession of such outrages must be expected from all other nations that had an object to gain by imitating it, and England would quickly lose whatever reputation and self-respect she is entitled to. Whatever her sins or offences, I cannot think that this would be a consummation which the true friends of liberty and law in any part of the world would have reason to regard with complacency. Much dissatisfaction has been expressed on all hands in the free States by the language and writings of Englishmen since your civil war commenced, but no reasonable American can doubt that if it had not been for the repressive power of public opinion, much more of the same kind in quantity and far more offensive in quality would have been uttered and published on your own ground; and that no English government could restrain the expression of opinion in England respecting such a crisis in a country in which we are all more or less in many ways interested. As to our own government itself, I am persuaded that its wishes and efforts have been altogether friendly and loyal towards the Northern States. Mistakes, misapprehensions and variety of opinions of all kinds in such a case are inevitable and should be allowed for. The importance of your crisis to yourselves makes you exceedingly sensitive and perhaps unduly exacting.

I have only time to say (being much urged for time) that the death of that noble champion of the slave, Francis Jackson, of Boston, was learned by me with very great regret and sympathy in your sorrow.

Yours, ever, RICHARD D. WEBB.

(1) We cannot forbear to express our astonishment, that a gentleman so intelligent as our Dublin correspondent should fail to mark the distinction between "political exiles" and the duly commissioned ambassadors of "the piratical Southern Confederacy," proclaimed such in that "official address" of Jefferson Davis to which he refers, and known to be such by the commander of the Trent.—*Ed. Standard.*

Philadelphia Correspondence.

PHILADELPHIA, Dec. 23, 1861.

THE Female Anti-Slavery Society of this city concluded, last Friday evening, its Twenty-fifth Annual Fair; the last, as it is understood to be, of the series. Some of the friends here, including the writer of these presents, thought at one time that it would not be best to hold a Fair this year; but others, including Mary Grew and Lucretia Mott, thought otherwise; and "wisdom has been justified of her children." The Twenty-fifth and last has, like all its predecessors, been a decided success. Where the things came from—who made them—by what unseen agency that large saloon was filled with profusely-covered and elegantly-decorated tables—was a matter of wonder and speculation to all comers. The only solution that seemed to offer itself was the general one, that it was caused in part by faith and hope, and in the remaining part by "righteousness and hard work." Whatever may have been the cause, the result was most gratifying. The room was well filled with buyers, sellers and spectators, and everything went on, during the continuance of the festival—for such it was—a sort of "feast of tabernacles"—as though no one had ever cherished a doubt as to the propriety of holding it. Grace was even given to those who had been believers speaking, generally, not to say to the doubters, "We told you so."

All things combined to favor the success of the measure. The agent for the hall, who had at first refused to let it for love or money, came at last, and in part for love and part for lucre, voluntarily offered it for half-price! As for the weather, it was beyond praise. It was a continued smile from the beginning to the end. That cherished individual, the "oldest inhabitant," was said to have never seen anything like it at that time of year. It was, in fact, "Indian summer," somewhat out of season to be sure, owing, perhaps, to the disjointed state of the times, but still marked by most of the characteristics of the glorious gorgeous "spell of weather" usually so called. In the morning, a hoar frost, with a veil of mist over the face of the sun; in the afternoon, a golden haze, with a gentle current from the south-west; and in the evening a brilliant sky, with an atmosphere balmy but sufficiently cool to keep the animal spirits up to the right point of enjoyment. Thus favored, the ladies who had charge of the enterprize were "bound" to succeed, and, as we have said, succeed they did.

In some of its circumstances this Fair was in strong contrast with that of last year. Then the town was in a state of intense excitement. The Fair-room had to be guarded, within and without, by a strong police force. Many were afraid to venture from their homes in that direction for fear of an outbreak. At every unusual noise in the streets, uneasy glances were directed from the windows, to see if the mob were coming. Not so this year. The city was quiet and the people kindly disposed. The "mob" were off at the war, there to fight, consciously or unconsciously, the battles of freedom. The liberty-flag floated peacefully over the street, its bell and motto objects of complacent interest, apparently, to all passers by. Nowhere was to be seen a sign or heard a whisper of dissent.

While there is but one opinion as to the success of the Fair, and while all have enjoyed it to an unusual degree as an occasion of social and spiritual communion, it is nevertheless the general understanding that this is to be regarded as the last of the series. There are a number of reasons for this conclusion, the chief of which perhaps is that this sort of instrumentality is no longer a necessity. The impression has become prevalent that our cause, as a moral controversy, as a strife on the arena of opinion, has culminated. Not that it has absolutely triumphed, or that our work is done; but that our *peculiar mission*, as pioneers, as agitators, as "jungle-clearers"—a mission that was committed to us alone—has been fulfilled, and that henceforth the duties devolving upon Abolitionists will not be such as necessarily to bring them into collision with the rest of the world, and compel them to resort to special methods for the pecuniary means of keeping up their operations. Undoubtedly a great work yet remains to be done by Abolitionists and Anti-Slavery Societies. If anyone thinks otherwise, or supposes that he can now lay off his harness and seek repose, he is very much mistaken. But in what remains to be done we may count on the cooperation of many who have heretofore opposed us. We shall not have to "tread the wine-press" alone. Our duties will no longer be peculiar.

The necessity of prolonging the existence of the National and State Anti-Slavery Societies, with their proper organs and appliances, no one entitled to an opinion will doubt. The good these organizations have accomplished is before the world; the beneficent uses they may yet be made to serve, are palpable, or may be rendered so, to the most obtuse. The pecuniary means of supporting them, so long as they are needed, will not be hard to procure. So far as this State is concerned, all that will be necessary will be for the President of the Pennsylvania Society—at least so long as the present incumbent occupies the chair—to issue his annual circular, setting forth, with the proper why and wherefore, the wants of the treasury, and for the Executive Committee, to take the necessary steps to bring this circular under the careful consideration of those whom it may concern. This done, the needed funds will be forthcoming. I speak without qualification, knowing whereof I affirm. A twenty-five years' acquaintance with the Pennsylvania Anti-Slavery Society warrants me in saying that no reasonable anti-slavery appeal made by its Executive Committee and fairly understood by its members, will fail of receiving the proper response. Some may be slow, and all may need stirring up; but as a body the Pennsylvania Abolitionists are a sort of people who, when a duty is fairly brought home to them, will not shrink from its performance.

And here, let me glance off, to say that the Abolitionists are not the only good people in the world. Nor are all who bear that title exactly what they ought to be. Looking over our old records we find the names of a good many shabby fellows; some who never had the "root of the matter in them," and others who "did run well" for a season, but who fell before temptation. There is danger of people in our condition "thinking more highly of themselves than they ought to think." People who stand for a principle against the world, who are bound together by a common persecution, and separated from others by a violent antagonism, should be expected, however, if, after a thirty years' pressure, they sometimes fail, as between themselves and others, in forming an impartial judgment. False estimates, requiring subsequent correction, are, under such circumstances, almost inevitable. Examples of this, if I may be allowed to say so, are to be found in the cases of our friends, the Covenanters and Quakers; and it is quite within the range of probabilities, that to these will be added, after awhile, the Abolitionists.

It is a great comfort, is it not, to find that there is more good in the world than we had supposed, and that people with whom we have to do are better than we had fancied them. This war, as it progresses, is making some very pleasing revelations in this regard. I have in my mind at this moment the facts in the case of the "Cooper shop institution," as it is called, or Volunteer Refreshment Saloon, which was established in the lower part of this city last spring, by the benevolence and patriotism of the people in that neighborhood, and which has been maintained by them ever since at great cost of time, labor and substance. The business of this establishment is to provide, free of charge, supper or breakfast, as the case may be, for regiments passing through, and needed comforts for the sick and wounded. The fidelity with which these self-imposed duties are performed, the cheerfulness with which the large corps required of volunteer attendants, men and women, get up from their beds in the middle of the night, and cook, and wait upon table, and wash dishes for this unostentatious but most useful charity, is really marvellous. Remember: this has been going on for months; and these services are sometimes required night after night for several nights in succession. Sick soldiers are taken home to be nursed, and sometimes to die, at the houses of people who never before saw or heard of them. No matter what the disease—camp-fever, or measles; the more dangerous it is, the more certain is its victim to be kindly cared for. There is no pay, in money, for all this; no glory; not even a chance of seeing their name in a newspaper. It all comes, so far, at least, as appearance goes, from the sheer goodness of the people's own hearts. If these things are done by the people of Moyamensing and Southwark, what may we not hope for from the people of the whole State?

The newspapers tell us of wholesale corruption, and Investigating Committees prove the truth of many of their charges; but this corruption, it is pleasant to believe, bears in its extent but a slight comparison with the integrity and devotion to duty, real or supposed, which mark the character and conduct of the great mass of the people. In all great revolutions the evil that exists finds its way to the surface, and selfish men seek to take the lead for their own advantage. In every great war that history records, no matter how pure its origin or holy the principle involved in the issue, corrupt men have been conspicuous in cabinet and field, and sensuality and base passions have been characteristics of the common soldier. Rarely, if ever, has there been a war on so large a scale where this has been less the case than in the one now waging. The intelligence, the enlarged patriotism, the self-sacrificing devotion to duty, which characterize thousands upon thousands in the ranks of our own national army, are without a parallel in any war of which history, to my knowledge at least, gives any account. We talk of the Revolution of 1776, and fancy that the men who fought its battles were actuated by higher motives and a purer patriotism than are our soldiers now in the field. If inquisition be made and the facts brought to light, it will be found that where one man then understood and appreciated the abstract doctrine at issue, of man's right to own and govern himself, there are ten in our army who understand and appreciate that doctrine still better, and who are ready to die for it in all the length and breadth of its application.

The evil in our country is enormously great; I would not underestimate it; but the good is incomparably greater. The base men in Congress are not a few; but the well-meaning and honorable greatly outnumber them. The self-seeking in our Cabinet is palpable and to be deplored; but the honorable ambition, the desire to acquire fame by distinguished services, are characteristics of some of its members equally conspicuous. Our President, to appearance, has not yet done much positive good, but he has been to the country an important negative advantage. He has done nothing yet to forfeit for himself his character for "honesty." This the only title he brought, undisputed, to his place, he still retains. If he keep it till the end, he will have fulfilled his promise and we shall have no just cause for complaint. The next time, taught by our experience, we must choose a man of more knowledge, more force, and greater fitness for the place. As it is, we might have done worse. Indeed, for aught that has yet appeared, we could not from the material offered have done better. So let us try to be content. We can stand the limping grammar and angular rhetoric of Mr. Lincoln's Messages so long as he tells the truth and talks sense, and can bear with his holding back and show of conservatism so long as the stronger men of his Cabinet are allowed to keep up with the people. On the former point, whatever we may think of his last effort, we have the consolation of knowing that there is not an hereditary monarch in Western Europe who could write a State paper of half its ability; and, on the latter, we may take comfort from analogy, in remembering that the leading horse in a team may slack chain and stop pulling going down hill, if he will only keep out of the way of those behind, on whom depends chiefly the safety of the load.

I had something more to say on the charges, too well founded, but needing qualification, of corruption in high places, but I am exceeding my limits and must stop. M.

MEMORIAL OF THE PEOPLE TO CONGRESS.

"Proclaim Liberty throughout all the land, to all the Inhabitants thereof."

To the Congress of the United States:

THE undersigned, citizens of , State of , respectfully submit—

That as the present formidable rebellion against the General government manifestly finds its root and nourishment in the system of chattel slavery at the South; as the leading conspirators are slaveholders, who constitute an oligarchy avowedly hostile to all free institutions; and as, in the nature of things, no solid peace can be maintained while the cause of this treasonable revolt is permitted to exist; your honorable body is urgently implored to lose no time in enacting, under the war power, the total abolition of slavery throughout the country—liberating unconditionally the slaves of all who are rebels, and, while not recognizing the right of property in man, allowing for the emancipated slaves of such as are loyal to the government a fair pecuniary award, as a conciliatory measure, and to facilitate an amicable adjustment of difficulties; and thus to bring the war to a speedy and beneficent termination, and indissolubly to unite all sections and all interests of the country upon the enduring basis of universal freedom.

☞ *Editors of newspapers are requested to give this Memorial one or more insertions in their columns.*

Printed copies of the above Memorial may be obtained at the Anti-Slavery Offices in New York, Philadelphia and Boston, and of Joel McMillan, Salem, Ohio. Persons applying to Mr. McMillan will enclose payment at the rate of $1.25 per hundred, to cover cost of paper and printing.

NOTICE.—Members of the American Anti-Slavery Society entitled to receive the Annual Report just published will have their copies forwarded by mail upon their remitting the amount of postage (in stamps or otherwise), viz.: *fourteen cents*, to ROBERT F. WALLCUT 221 Washington Street, Boston.

OBITUARY.

DIED, in Brookline, Mass., Dec. 20th, EMMA WILLARD, wife of John C. Wyman, and daughter of the late Dr. George Willard, of Uxbridge, Mass. There may not be many among our readers to whom this announcement will be a grief, so strictly private was all of the life which has just closed, and so secluded had its later years been made by long and slow disease. The few, however, who had the happiness of knowing Mrs. Wyman, will feel a pang to think that a spirit at once so true, so tender and so strong has passed away forever from earth and earthly communion. A character of uncommon equipoise of qualities, a well cultivated mind, a refined taste, a heart full of sympathy, and swift to go forth to meet love and friendship, joined to great personal beauty and an irresistible charm of manner, the fitting abode and expression of the soul within, secured to her the admiration of all who knew her slightly, and the warm affection and tender friendship of all who knew her well. From her girlhood she made herself one with the anti-slavery movement, and her interest in it remained fresh and warm to the last. Her life, chastened by many sorrows and made heavy by long years of suffering, was solaced and sustained, as it passed and at its close, by every tender office that love and friendship could bestow. And she dwells in the memory of those that knew her best and loved her most as an example of complete and rounded womanhood, who, while she yet walked on earth, was but a little lower than the angels.

THE TWENTY-EIGHTH

NATIONAL ANTI-SLAVERY SUBSCRIPTION ANNIVERSARY.

THE time for the ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION ANNIVERSARY again draws nigh, and we look forward to it with pleasure, as the means of meeting familiar, friendly faces, and listening to earnest words of counsel and encouragement. Some say that other agencies are now in such active operation, that "the old Abolitionists," as they are called, can well afford to rest upon their oars, while others carry forward their work to its completion. We cannot view the subject in this light. Our mission is the same now that it was thirty years ago. Through many and strange changes, we have slowly but steadily advanced toward its fulfilment; but there are many indications that our work is not yet in a state to be safely left in other hands. We have been, and we must still be, a fire to warm the atmosphere of public opinion. More than a quarter of a century ago, the fire was kindled with generous zeal, and year after year it has been fed with untiring industry and patience. Not all the cold water that politicians, merchants, and ecclesiatical bodies could throw upon it has sufficed to extinguish the flame, or even to prevent it from spreading. The moral thermometer can never again fall to the old freezing point. In view of this, we thank God, and take courage. But who that observes passing events, and reflects upon their indications, can arrive at the conclusion that the fire is no longer needed?

It is true that blood and treasure are lavishly expended to put down a most wicked and sanguinary rebellion, the proclaimed purpose of which is to extend and perpetuate SLAVERY. But the government of the United States manifests, in every possible way, a vigilant carefulness to protect the claims of slavery, and politicians are continually announcing that the war has nothing to do with the cause of the war. There are now very few slaveholders who condescend to profess allegiance to the government; yet, small as is the remnant of that powerful and unprincipled oligarchy, they still appear to govern the counsels of the nation. The honest expression of the PEOPLE'S wishes is required to be suppressed, lest the utterance should prove offensive to this arrogant minority, so long accustomed to rule the majority. The people are full of generous enthusiasm for their country. If the polar star of a great idea were presented to them, they would follow it with eager courage through suffering and death. But it seems to be the aim of politicians to create a fog so dense that neither star nor sunlight shall glimmer through it to guide the millions, who are longing to be led in the right direction.

Is *this* a time to let the sacred fire smoulder on the altar of freedom? On the contrary, there has never been a time when it was more necessary to watch it with vigilance, and feed it with untiring activity.

We, Abolitionists, still have unwavering faith that "a straight line is always the shortest, in morals as well as in mathematics." Politicians are always in need of being convinced of this obvious truth; and they are peculiarly in need of it now. Let us, then, continue to work for the good old cause in every way that is consistent with our own conscientious convictions. Let us meet together, that our hearts may be cheered and our hands strengthened for whatsoever work the God of the oppressed may call upon us to do.

All those who have faith in the principles of freedom, all who believe that the effect of righteousness would be peace and security for our unhappy country, are cordially and earnestly invited to meet us at the usual time and place in Boston, in January next. [Particulars hereafter.]

Contributions, and expressions of sympathy, from friends at home or abroad, in person or by letter, will be most thankfully received; for we have great need of both at this most momentous and trying crisis.

L. Maria Child,	Caroline M. Severance,
Mary May,	Mary Willey,
Louisa Loring,	Ann Rebecca Bramhall,
Henrietta Sargent,	Sarah P. Remond,
Sarah Russell May,	Mary E. Stearns,
Helen Eliza Garrison,	Sarah J. Nowell,
Anna Shaw Greene,	Elizabeth Von Arnim,
Sarah Blake Shaw,	Anne Langdon Alger,
Elizabeth Gay,	Eliza Apthorp,
Caroline Thayer,	Sarah Cowing,
Abby Kelley Foster,	Sarah H. Southwick,
Lydia D. Parker,	Mary Elizabeth Sargent,
Augusta G. King,	Sarah C. Atkinson,
Mattie Griffith,	Abby Francis,
Mary Jackson,	Mary Jane Parkman,
Evelina A. Smith,	Georgiana Otis,
Katherine E. Farnum,	Abby H. Stephenson.

Proceedings of Congress.

In the Senate, Dec. 26th, Mr. HALE, of New Hampshire, offered a resolution calling upon the President to transmit to the Senate copies of all dispatches which have passed between our government and that of Great Britain relative to the seizure of Mason and Slidell. Mr. Sumner objected to its consideration. Mr. Hale advocated its passage in a speech of considerable length, in which he opposed the restitution of the rebel envoys, and advocated in preference a war with Great Britain. The resolution was laid over under the rule. Mr. Harlan, of Iowa, introduced a bill to establish a Provisional government in all the seceded States.

On Monday, petitions were presented from New York, Connecticut, Massachusetts and Pennsylvania, praying for the emancipation of the slaves. A communication was received from the Secretary of War, refusing to submit to the Senate the correspondence between Gens. Scott and Patterson. Mr. Davis, of Kentucky, introduced a bill, which was referred to the Judiciary Committee, declaring certain persons alien enemies and sacrificing their property for the benefit of loyal persons.

Chronicles of the War.

The Emancipated South Carolinians.

The N. Y. *Express* has a correspondent with our army at Port Royal, whose account of the sayings and doings of the "contrabands" of that region differs widely from the *editorial* teachings of that same *Express*, though agreeing with the statements of our own correspondent. Here is a sample, taken from its account of the burning of his cotton-houses by Mr. Hugh Wilson and the escape to our soldiers of a portion of his slaves:

"They asserted that they had long been expecting and praying for our coming, and they had determined whenever we should arrive to make their way instantly to us. Capt. Ammen offered them permission to return, but though they said they had left their wives and children, 'Massa would kill if we go back,' and they preferred to remain. When asked why they left their master, they replied—at least a thousand negroes have said within my hearing within the last six weeks—that they were badly treated, got only a peck of corn a week and no other food, no bacon, no salt, had shoes only every other year, had had no clothes given them for a long time, but had been worked hard. The negroes indeed of this whole region persist in saying that they have been miserably fed and clad, not an exception to this fallen beneath my notice. These of Mr. Wilson's say that they had been obliged to boil down sea water for salt, and many others told me this story; they also said, however, that the only salt on the planters' tables was procured in the same way; they had seen no gold or silver in a long while; they had scraps of Confederate paper money with them. They gave us the first information we had received of the great fire at Charleston, and the next day all that they told us in this matter was confirmed by the papers found at Rockville. These blacks were examined separately and told the same tale, which I could see no reason to disbelieve. Within an hour or two of their arrival, the other three who had been set to watching Massa's children also came aboard, and they had left the children in the carriage house. The meeting between those who first arrived and this second party was full of warmth and cordiality. The late comers were more intelligent than their predecessors, but reasserted the same story. I have been particular in giving these details, because I have seen it stated in a number of Southern papers that the slaves are still faithful to their masters, and in Northern journals that the reports about the fugitives are exaggerated. But everything I have seen or heard confirms me in the opinion that the whole slave population of South Carolina will desert its masters at the earliest opportunity. Two of these negroes declared that they had come from Charleston within two days, and that the blacks there waited anxiously for us and would instantly join us, if we approached. They were all given the rations of common sailors, and declared they had never fared so well before. Their actions corroborated their words. They manifested the greatest eagerness to inform us of the whereabouts of rebel troops; told of pickets and small parties stationed at different houses along the river, and especially that there were 400 or 500 in tents near Rockville."

There are 400,000 of these people in South Carolina—all for the Union and its flag—all accustomed to earn their own living and that of their masters also—and there are but 300,000 whites in the State, not all rebels by many. Yet South Carolina is currently spoken of as unanimously hostile to the Union! That the rebels should make that sort of count, is hardly surprising; but why should we follow their lead? Why not count our 400,000 *certain* Unionists against their 300,000 dubi-secessionists, and claim the 100,000 loyal majority that we truly have? We can take the State whenever we will by simply calling those people to our side and letting them help us save the Union? If we let the nation be dismembered and destroyed for want of the sense or the pluck to do this, History will brand us with pusillanimity and treason. And yet we tremble lest the golden moment will be allowed to slip by unimproved. One month ago, ten thousand well-appointed soldiers could have taken the State, by the help of her loyal people; since then, several drilled regiments have been sent down from Virginia, and others brought up from the Gulf States and we fear the enterprise will be found far more difficult. Statesmen! leaders! save the Republic.—*Tribune.*

From Missouri.

Our advices from Missouri are of the highest importance—they indicate the speedy redemption of every part of the State from rebel control. Reliable information has been received at Gen. Pope's headquarters at Otterville, that Price has again commenced to retreat Southward with his whole force. At last accounts, one division of his army was at Neosho, while the main body, with himself at the head, had just left Humansville on its way from Warsaw. This retrograde movement Price says is in obedience to orders from Jeff. Davis, but his men understood that it is in consequence of the advance of the National forces under Gen. Pope, and the fear that supplies from the South would be cut off. So fearful was he of pursuit that he burnt all the bridges as fast as his army passed them, and placed obstructions in the roads. He was last heard from at Springfield.

It is believed that the movement will be a most disadvantageous one for the rebel cause, and eventuate in its speedy overthrow in the entire State. The late vigorous operations of Gen. Pope have thus not only had immediate, but will have ultimate results of vast importance.

The Mississippi Fleet almost Ready.

The Times of Tuesday publishes a full account of the Mississippi gunboat and mortar fleet—at least all the facts and details concerning it which the military authorities think proper to be published. The hour of readiness and the day of sailing of this flotilla have been so often promised as at hand, and so frequently deferred to an indefinite future, that some folks have almost begun to think the whole thing a Western myth, or at least that it would not be ready until the rebels were crushed and the war was over. But it will be seen that the fleet is a thing of such vast proportions, and of so formidable a character, that it seems almost incredible that it should have been got to its present stage of readiness in five short months. The whole flotilla, consisting of twelve enormously strong gunboats, mounting nearly two hundred of the heaviest guns, and sixty-six mortar-boats and their aids, are now at Cairo, taking aboard the powder and shot that will soon burst as thunder and light

THE STANDARD.

THE WAR.

LECTURE BY WENDELL PHILLIPS, ESQ.,

AT THE COOPER INSTITUTE, NEW YORK.

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: It would be impossible for me fitly to thank you for this welcome; you will allow me, therefore, not to attempt it, but to avail myself of your patience to speak to you, as I have been invited to do, upon the war.

I know, ladies and gentlemen, that actions—deeds, not words—are the fitting duty of the hour. Yet, still, cannon think in this day of ours, and it is only by putting thought behind arms that we render them worthy, in any degree, of the civilization of the nineteenth century (applause). Besides, the government has two-thirds of a million of soldiers, and it has ships sufficient for its purpose. The only question seems to be, what the government is to do with these forces; in what path and how far it shall tread. You and I come here to-night, not to criticize, not to find fault with the Cabinet. We come here to recognize the fact, that in moments like these, the statesmanship of the Cabinet is but a pine shingle upon the rapids of Niagara, borne which way the great popular heart and the national purpose direct. It is in vain now, with these scenes about us, in this crisis, to endeavor to create public opinion; too late now to educate twenty million of people. Our object now is to concentrate and to manifest, to make evident and to make intense, the matured purpose of the nation. We are to show the world, if it be indeed so, that democratic institutions are strong enough for such an hour as this. Very terrible as is the conspiracy, momentous as is the peril, Democracy welcomes the struggle (applause), confident that she stands like no delicately-poised throne in the Old World, but, like the pyramid, on its broadest base, able to be patient with national evils—generously patient with the long forbearance of three generations—and strong enough when, after that they reveal themselves in their own inevitable and hideous proportions, to pronounce and execute the unanimous verdict—Death! (Sensation).

Now, gentlemen, it is in such a spirit, with such a purpose, that I come before you to-night to sustain this war. Whence came this war? You and I need not curiously investigate. While Mr. Everett on one side, and Mr. Sumner on the other, agree, you and I may take for granted the opinion of two such opposite statesmen—the result of the common sense of this side of the water and the other—that slavery is the root of this war (applause). I know some men have loved to trace it to disappointed ambition, to the success of the Republican party, convincing 300,000 nobles at the South, who have hitherto furnished us the most of the Presidents, Generals, Judges and Ambasssadors we needed, that they would have leave to stay at home, and that twenty million of Northerners would take their share in public affairs. I do not think that cause equal to the result. Other men before Jefferson Davis and Gov. Wise have been disappointed of the Presidency. Henry Clay, Daniel Webster, and Stephen A. Douglas were more than once disappointed, and yet who believes that either of these great men could have armed the North to avenge his wrongs? Why, then, should these pigmies of the South be able to do what the giants I have named could never achieve? (Applause.) Simply because there is a radical difference between the two sections, and that difference is slavery. A party victory may have been the *occasion* of this outbreak. So a tea-chest was the occasion of the Revolution, and it went to the bottom of Boston harbor on the night of the 16th of December, 1773; but that tea-chest was not the cause of the Revolution, neither is Jefferson Davis the cause of the rebellion (applause and laughter). If you will look upon the map, and notice that every slave State has joined or tried to join the rebellion, and no free State has done so, I think you will not doubt substantially the origin of this convulsion.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, you know me—those of you who know me at all—simply as an Abolitionist. I am proud and glad that you should have known me as such (applause). In the twenty-five years that are gone—I say it with no wish to offend any man before me—but in the quarter of a century that has passed, I could find no place where an American could stand with decent self-respect, except in constant, uncontrollable and loud protest against the sin of his native land (applause). But, ladies and gentlemen, do not imagine that I come here to-night to speak simply and exclusively as an Abolitionist. My interest in this war, simply and exclusively as an Abolitionist, is about as much gone as yours in a novel when the hero has won the lady, and the marriage has been comfortably celebrated in the last chapter (laughter and applause). I know the danger of political prophecy—a kaleidoscope of which not even a Yankee can guess the next combination—but for all that, I venture to offer my opinion, that on this continent the system of domestic slavery has received its death-blow (loud and long-continued applause). Let me tell you why I think so. Leaving out of view war with England, which I do not expect, there are but three paths out of this war. One is, the North conquers; the other is, the South conquers; and the third is, a compromise. Now, if the North conquers, or there be a compromise, one or the other of two things must come—either the old Constitution or a new one. I believe that, so far as the slavery clauses of the Constitution of '89 are concerned, it is dead. It seems to me impossible that the thrifty and pains-taking North, after keeping 600,000 men idle for two or three years, at the cost of two million dollars a day; after that flag lowered at Sumter; after Baker and Lyon and Ellsworth and Winthrop and Putnam and Wesse hœft have given their lives to quell the rebellion; after our Massachusetts boys, hurrying from ploughed field and workshop to save the Capital, have been foully murdered on the pavements of Baltimore—I cannot believe in a North so lost, so craven, as to put back slavery where it stood on the 4th of March last (cheers). But if there be reconstruction without those slave clauses, then in a little while, longer or shorter, slavery dies—indeed, on any other basis but the basis of '89, she has nothing else now to do but to die. On the contrary, if the South—no, I cannot say conquers; my lips will not form that word—but if she balk us of victory, the only way she can do it is to write Emancipation on her own banner, and thus bribe the friends of liberty in Europe to allow its aristocrats and traders to divide the majestic Republic whose growth and trade they fear and envy. Either way, the slave goes free. Unless England flings her fleets along the coast, the South can never spring into separate existence, except from the basis of negro freedom; and I, for one, cannot yet believe that the North will consent again to share his chains. Exclusively as an Abolitionist, therefore, I have little more interest in this war than the frontiersman's wife had in his struggle with the bear, when she didn't care which whipped (laughter and applause). But before I leave the Abolitionists, let me say one word. Some men say we are the cause of this war. Gentlemen, you do us too much honor! (Cheers and laughter.) If it be so, we have reason to be proud of it; for in my heart, as an American, I believe this year the most glorious of the Republic since '76 (great applause). The North, craven and contented until now, like Mammon, saw nothing even in heaven but the golden pavement; to-day she throws off her chains. We have a North, as Daniel Webster said. This is no epoch for nations to blush at. England might blush, in 1620, when Englishmen trembled at a tool's frown, and were silent when James forbade them to think; but not in 1649, when an outraged people cut off his son's head. Massachusetts might have blushed a year or two ago, when an insolent Virginian, standing on Bunker Hill, insulted the Commonwealth, and then dragged her citizens to Washington to tell what they knew about John Brown; but she has no reason to blush to-day, when she holds that same impudent Senator an acknowledged felon in her prison fort (uproarious applause). In my view, the bloodiest war ever waged is infinitely better than the happiest slavery that ever fattened men into obedience (cheers). And yet I love peace. But it is real peace; not peace such as we have had; not peace that meant lynch law in the Carolinas and mob law in New York; not peace that meant chains around Boston Court-House, a gag on the lips of statesmen, and the slave sobbing himself to sleep in curses. No more such peace for me; no peace that is not born of justice, and does not recognize the rights of every race and every man (loud cheering).

Some men say they would view this war as white men. I condescend to no such narrowness. I view it as an American citizen, proud to be the citizen of an empire that knows neither black nor white, neither Saxon nor Indian, but holds an equal sceptre over all (loud cheers). If I am to love my country, it must be loveable; if I am to honor it, it must be worthy of respect. What is the function God gives us—what is the breadth of responsibility he lays upon us? An empire, the home of every race, every creed, every tongue, to whose citizens is committed, if not the only, then the grandest system of pure self-government. De Tocqueville tells us that all nations and all ages tend with inevitable certainty to this result, but he points out, as history does, this land as the normal school of the nations; set by God to try the experiment of popular education and popular government, to remove the obstacles, point out the dangers, find the best way, encourage the timid and hasten the world's progress. Let us see to it, that with such a crisis and such a past, neither the ignorance, nor the heedlessness, nor the cowardice of Americans forfeits this high honor, won for us by the toils of two generations, given to us by the blessing of Providence. It is as a citizen of the leading State of this Western continent, vast in territory, and yet its territory nothing compared with the grandeur of its past and the majesty of its future—it is as such a citizen that I wish, for one, to find out my duty, express as an individual my opinion, and aid thereby the Cabinet in doing its duty under such responsibility. It does not lie in one man to ruin us, nor in one man to save us, nor in a dozen. It lies in the twenty million, in the thirty million, of thirty-four States.

Now, how do we stand? In a war—not only that, but a terrific war—not a war sprung from the caprice of a woman, the spite of a priest, the flickering ambition of a prince, as wars usually have; but a war inevitable; in one sense, nobody's fault; the inevitable result of past training, the conflict of ideas, millions of people grappling each other's throats, every soldier in each camp certain that he is fighting for an idea that holds the salvation of the world—every drop of his blood in earnest. Such a war finds no parallel nearer than that of the Catholic and the Huguenot of France, or than that of Aristocrat and Republican in 1790, or of Cromwell and the Irish, when victory meant extermination. Such is our war. I look upon it as the commencement of the great struggle between the hidden aristocracy and the democracy of America. You are to say to-day whether it shall last ten years or seventy, as it usually has done. It resembles closely that struggle between aristocrat and democrat which began in France in 1790, and continues still. While it lasts, it will have the same effect on the nation as that war between blind loyalty, represented by the Stuart family, and the free spirit of the English Constitution, which lasted from 1660 to 1760, and made England a second-rate power almost all that century.

Such is the era on which you are entering. I will not speak of war in itself—I have no time; I will not say with Napoleon that it is the practice of barbarians; I will not say that it is good. It is better than the past. A thing may be *better*, and yet not *good*. This war is better than the past, but there is not an element of good in it. I mean, there is nothing in it that we might not have gotten better, fuller and more perfectly in other ways. And yet it is better than the craven past, infinitely better than a peace which had pride for its father and subserviency for its mother. Neither will I speak of the cost of war, although you know that we never shall get out of this one without a debt of at least two or three thousand million of dollars. For, if the prevalent theory prove correct, and the country comes together again on anything like the old basis, we pay Jeff. Davis's debts as well as our own. Neither will I remind you that debt is the fatal disease of republics, the first thing and the mightiest to undermine government and corrupt the people. The great debt of England has kept her back in civil progress at least a hundred years. Neither will I remind you that when we go out of this war, we go out with an immense disbanded army, an intense military spirit embodied in two-thirds of a million of soldiers, the fruitful, the inevitable source of fresh debts and new wars; I pass by all that; yet lying within those causes are things enough to make the most sanguine friends of free institutions tremble for our future. I pass those by. But let me remind you of another tendency of the time. You know, for instance, that the writ of *habeas corpus*, by which government is bound to render a reason to the judiciary before it lays its hands upon a citizen, has been called the high-water mark of English liberty. Jefferson, in his calm moments, dreaded the power to suspend it in any emergency whatever, and wished to have it in "eternal and unremitting force." The present Napoleon, in his treatise on the English Constitution, calls it the gem of English institutions. Lieber says that *habeas corpus*, free meetings like this, and a free press, are the three elements which distinguish liberty from despotism. All that Saxon blood has gained in the battles and toils of two hundred years are these three things. But to-day, Mr. Chairman, every one of them—*habeas corpus*, the right of free meeting and a free press—is annihilated in every square mile of the Republic. We live to-day, every one of us, under martial law. The Secretary of State puts into his bastile, with a warrant as irresponsible as that of Louis, any man whom he pleases. And you know that neither press nor lips may venture to arraign the government without being silenced. At this moment one thousand men, at least, are "bastiled" by an authority as despotic as that of Louis—three times as many as Eldon and George III. seized when they trembled for his throne. Mark me, I am not complaining. I do not say it is not necessary. It is necessary to do anything to save the ship (applause). It is necessary to throw everything overboard in order that we may float. It is a mere question whether you prefer the despotism of Washington or that of Richmond. I prefer that of Washington (loud applause). But, nevertheless, I point out to you this tendency because it is momentous in its significance. We are tending with rapid strides, you say *inevitably*—I do not deny it; *necessarily*—I do not question it; we are tending toward that strong government which frightened Jefferson; toward that unlimited debt, that endless army. We have already those alien and sedition laws which, in 1798, wrecked the Federal party, and summoned the Democratic into existence. For the first time on this continent, we have passports, which even Louis Napoleon pronounces useless and odious. For the first time in our history, government spies frequent our great cities. And this model of a strong government, if you reconstruct it on the old basis, is to be handed into the keeping of whom? If you compromise it by reconstruction, to whom are you to give these delicate and grave powers? To compromisers. Reconstruct this government, and for twenty years you can never elect a Republican. Presidents must be so wholly without character or principle, that two angry parties, each hopeless of success, contemptuously tolerate them as neutrals. Now, I am not exaggerating the moment. I can parallel it entirely. It is the same position that England held in the times of Eldon and Fox, when Holcroft and Montgomery, the poet, Horne Tooke and Frost and Hardy went into dungeons, under laws that Pitt executed and Burke praised—times when Fox said he despaired of English liberty but for the power of insurrection—times which Sydney Smith said he remembered, when no man was entitled to an opinion who had not £3,000 a year. Why! there is no right—do I exaggerate when I say that there is no single right—that government is scrupulous and finds itself able to protect, except the pretended right of a man to his slaves! (Laughter.) Every other right has fallen now before the necessities of the hour.

Understand me, I do not complain of this state of things; but it is momentous. I only ask you that out of this peril you be sure to get something worthy of the crisis through which you have passed. No government of free make could stand three such trials as this. I only paint you the picture, in order, like Hotspur, to say, "Out of this nettle, danger, be you right eminently sure that you pluck the flower, safety" (applause). Standing in such a crisis, certainly it commands us that we should endeavor to find the root of the difficulty, and that now, once for all, we should put it beyond the possibility of troubling our peace again. We cannot afford, as Republicans, to run that risk. The vessel of State—her timbers are strained beyond almost the possibility of surviving. The tempest is one which it demands the wariest pilot to outlive. We cannot afford, thus warned, to omit anything which can save this ship of State from a second danger of the kind.

Well, what shall we do? The answer to that question comes partly from what we think has been the cause of this convulsion. Some men think—some of your editors think—many of ours, too—that this war is nothing but the disappointment of one or two thousand angered politicians, who have persuaded eight million of Southerners, against their convictions, to take up arms and rush to the battle-field—no great compliment to Southern sense (laughter). They think that if the Federal army could only appear in the midst of this demented mass, the eight million will find out for the first time in their lives that they have got souls of their own; tell us so, and then we shall all be piloted back, float back, drift back into the good old times of Franklin Pierce and James Buchanan (laughter). Well, there is a measure of truth in that. I believe that if a year ago, when the thing first showed itself, Jefferson Davis, and Toombs, and Keitt, and Wise, and the rest, had been hung for traitors at Washington, and a couple of frigates anchored at Charleston, another couple in Savannah, and half a dozen in New Orleans, with orders to shell those cities on the first note of resistance, there never would have been this outbreak (applause), or it would have been postponed at least a dozen years; and if that interval had been used to get rid of slavery, we never should have heard of the convulsion. But you know we had nothing of the kind, and the consequence is, what? Why, the bewildered North has been summoned by every defeat, and every success, from its workshops and its factories, to gaze with half-opened eyes at the lurid heavens, until at last, divided, bewildered, confounded, as this 20,000,000 were, we have all of us fused into one idea, that the Union meant Justice—shall mean Justice—owns down to the Gulf, and we will have it (applause). Well, what has taken place meanwhile at the South? Why, the same thing. The divided, bewildered South has been summoned also out of her divisions by every success and every defeat (and she has had more of the first than we have), and the consequence is that she, too, is fused into a swelling sea of State pride, Northern hate—

> "Unconquerable will,
> And study of revenge, immortal hate,
> And courage never to submit nor yield."

She is in earnest, every man, and she is as unanimous as the Colonies were in the Revolution. In fact, the South recognizes more intelligibly than we do the necessities of her position. I do not consider this a secession. It is no secession. I agree with Bishop General Polk—it is a conspiracy, not a secession. There is no wish, no intention, to go peaceably and permanently off. It is a conspiracy to make the government do the will and accept the policy of the slaveholders. Its root is at the South, but it has many a branch in Wall street and in State street (cheers). It is a conspiracy, and on the one side of every man who still thinks that he that steals his brother is a gentleman, and he that makes his living is not (applause). It is the aristocratic element which survived the Constitution, which our fathers thought could be left under it, and the South to-day is forced into this war by the natural growth of the antagonistic principle. You may pledge whatever submission and patience of Southern institutions you please, it is not enough. South Carolina said to Massachusetts, in 1835, when Edward Everett was Governor, "Abolish free speech—it is a nuisance." She is right—from her stand-point it is (laughter). That is, it is not possible to preserve the quiet of South Carolina consistently with free speech; but you know the story Walter Scott told of the Scotch laird, who said to his old butler, "Jock, you and I can't live under this roof." "And where does your honor think of going?" So free speech says to South Carolina to-day. Now I say, you may pledge, compromise, guarantee what you please. The South knows it is not your purpose—it is your character that she dreads. It is the nature of Northern institutions, the perilous freedom of discussion, the flavor of our ideas, the sight of our growth, the very neighborhood of such States, that constitutes the danger. It is like the two vases launched on the stormy sea. The iron said to the crockery, "I won't come near." "Thank you, thank you," said the weaker vessel; "there is as much danger in my coming near you." This the South feels; hence her determination; hence, indeed, the imperious necessity that she should rule and shape our government, or of sailing out of it. I do not mean that she plans to take possession of the North, and choose our Northern mayors, though she has done that in Boston for the last dozen years, and here till this fall. But she conspires and aims to control just so much of our policy, trade, offices, presses, pulpits, cities, as is sufficient to ensure the undisturbed existence of slavery. She conspires with the full intent so to mould this government as to keep it what it has been for thirty years, according to John Quincy Adams—a plot for the extension and perpetuation of slavery. As the world advances, fresh guarantees are demanded. The nineteenth century requires sterner gags than the eighteenth. Often as the peace of Virginia is in danger, you must be willing that a Virginia Mason shall drag your citizens to Washington, and imprison them at his pleasure. So long as Carolina needs it, you must submit that your ships be searched for dangerous passengers, and every Northern man lynched. No more Kansas rebellions. It is a conflict between the two powers, Aristocracy and Democracy, *which shall hold this belt of the continent*. You may live here, New York men, but it must be in submission to such rules as the quiet of Carolina requires. That is the meaning of the oft-repeated threat to call the roll of one's slaves on Bunker Hill and dictate peace in Faneuil Hall. Now, in that fight, I go for the North, for the Union.

In order to make out this theory of "irrepressible conflict," it is not necessary to suppose that every Southerner hates every Northerner (as *The Atlantic* urges). But this much is true: some 300,000 slaveholders at the South, holding two thousand million of so-called property in their hands, controlling the blacks and betooling the seven million of poor whites into being their tools, into believing their interest is opposed to ours—this order of nobles, this privileged class, has been able for forty years to keep the government in dread, dictate terms by threatening disunion, bring us to its verge at least twice, and now almost to break the Union in pieces. A power thus consolidated, which has existed seventy years, setting up and pulling down parties, controlling the policy of the government, and changing our religion, and is emboldened by uniform success, will not burst like a bubble in an hour. For all practical purposes, it is safe to speak of it as the South; no other South exists, or will exist, till our policy develops it into being. This is what I mean. An Aristocracy rooted in wealth, with its net-work spread over all social life, its poison penetrating every fibre of society, is the hardest possible evil to destroy. Its one influence, FASHION, is often able to mock at Religion, Trade, Literature and Politics combined. One-half the reason why Washington has been and is in peril—why every move is revealed and checkmated—is, that your President is unfashionable, and Mrs. Jefferson Davis is not. Unseen chains are sometimes stronger than those of iron, and heavier than those of gold.

It is not in the plots, it is in the inevitable character of the Northern States that the South sees her danger. And the struggle is between these two ideas. Our fathers, as I said, thought they could be left, one to outgrow the other. They took gunpowder and a lighted match, forced them into a stalwart cannon, screwed down the muzzle, and thought they could secure peace. But it has resulted differently, their cannon has exploded, and we stand among fragments.

Now, some Republicans and some Democrats—not Butler and Bryant, and Cochrane, and Cameron, not Boutwell, and Banc[illegible], and Dickinson, and others—but the old set (laughter)—the old set say to the Republicans, "Lay the pieces carefully together in their places; put the gunpowder and the match in again (laughter): say the Constitution backward instead of your prayers, and there will never be another rebellion!" (Cheers and laughter.) Now, I doubt it (cheers). It seems to me that like causes will produce like effects. If the reason of the war is because we are two nations, then the cure must be to make us one nation, to remove that cause which divides us, to make our institutions homogeneous. If it were possible to subjugate the South and leave slavery where it is, where is the security that we should not have another war in ten years? Indeed, such a course invites another war, whenever demagogues please. I believe the policy of reconstruction is impossible. And if it were possible, it would be the greatest mistake that Northern men could commit (cheers). I will not stop to remind you that, standing as we do to-day with the full constitutional right to abolish slavery—a right Southern treason has just given us—a right the use of which is enjoined by the sternest necessity—if, after that, the North goes back to the Constitution of '89, she assumes, a second time, afresh, unnecessarily, a criminal responsibility for slavery. Hereafter no old excuse will avail us. A second time, with open eyes, against our highest interest, we clasp bloody hands with tyrants to uphold an acknowledged sin, whose fell evil we have fully proved.

But that aside, peace with an unchanged Constitution would leave us to stand like Mexico. States married, not matched; chained together, not melted into one; foreign nations aware of our hostility, and interfering to embroil, rob and control us. We should be what Greece was under the intrigues of Philip, and Germany when Louis XIV. was in fact her dictator. We may see our likeness in Austria, every fretful province an addition of weakness; In Italy, twenty years ago, a leash of angry hounds. A Union with unwilling and subjugated States, smarting with defeat, and yet holding the powerful and dangerous element of slavery in it, and an army disbanded into laborers, food for constant disturbance, would be a standing invitation to France and England to insult and dictate, to thwart our policy, demand changes in our laws, and trample on us continually.

Reconstruction is but another name for the submission of the North. It is her subjection under a mask. It is nothing but the confession of defeat. Every merchant, in such a case, puts everything he has at the bidding of Wigfall and Toombs in every cross-road bar-room at the South. For, you see, never till now did anybody but a few Abolitionists believe that this nation could be marshaled one section against the other in arms. But the secret is out. The weak point is discovered. Why does the London press lecture us like a schoolmaster his seven-years-old boy? Why does England use a tone such as she has not used for half a century to any power? Because she knows us as she knows Mexico, as all Europe knows Austria—that we have the cancer concealed in our very vitals. Slavery left where it is, after having created such a war as this, would leave our commerce and all our foreign relations at the mercy of any Keitt, Wigfall, Wise or Toombs. Any demagogue has only to stir up a pro-slavery crusade, point back to the safe experiment of 1861, and lash the passions of the aristocrats to cover the sea with privateers, put in jeopardy the trade of twenty States, plunge the country into millions of debt, send our stocks down fifty per cent., and cost thousands of lives. Reconstruction is but making chronic what now is transient. What that is, this week shows. What that is, we learn from the tone England dares to assume toward this divided republic. I do not believe reconstruction possible. I do not believe the Cabinet intend it. True, I should care little if they did, since I believe the Administration can no more resist the progress of events than a spear of grass can retard the step of an avalanche. But if they do, allow me to say, for one, that every dollar spent in this war is worse than wasted, every life lost is a public murder, and that any statesman who leads these States back to reconstruction will be damned to an infamy compared with which Arnold was a saint, and James Buchanan a public benefactor. [Slight disturbance in the rear part of the hall, cries of "Put him out," etc.] I said reconstruction is not possible. I do not believe it is, for this reason: the moment these States begin to appear victorious, the moment our armies do anything that evinces final success, the wily statesmanship and unconquerable hate of the South will write "Emancipation" on her banner, and welcome the protectorate of a European power. And if you read the European papers of to-day, you need not doubt that they will have it. Intelligent men agree that the North stands better with Palmerston for minister than she would with any minister likely to succeed him. And who is Palmerston? While he was Foreign Secretary, from 1848 to '51, the British press ridiculed every effort of the French Republicans—sneered at Cavaignac and Ledru Rollin, Lamartine and Hugo—while they cheered Napoleon on to his usurpation, and Lord Normanby, then minister at Paris, early in December, while Napoleon's hand was still wet with the best blood of France, congratulated the despot on his victory over the Reds, applying to the friends of Liberty the worst epithet that an Englishman knows. This last outrage lost Palmerston his place; but he rules to-day—though rebuked, not changed.

The value of the English news this week is the indication of the nation's mind. No one doubts now, that should the South emancipate, England would make haste to recognize and help her. In ordinary times the government and aristocracy of England dread American example. They may well admire and envy the strength of our government, when, instead of England's impressment and pinched levies, patriotism marshals six hundred thousand *volunteers* in six months. The English merchant is jealous of our growth; only the liberal middle classes really sympathize with us. When the two other classes are divided, this middle class rules. But now, Herod and Pilate are agreed. The aristocrat, who usually despises a trader, whether of Manchester or Liverpool, as the South does a negro, now is secessionist from sympathy, as the trader is from interest. Such a union no middle class can checkmake. The only danger of war with England is, that as soon as England declared war with us, she would recognize the Southern Confederacy, immediately, just as she stands, slavery and all, as a military measure. As such, in the heat of passion, in the smoke of war, the English people, all of them, would allow such a recognition even of a slaveholding empire. War with England ensures disunion. When England declares war, she gives slavery a fresh lease of fifty years. Even if we have no war with England, let another eight or ten months be as little successful as the last, and Europe will acknowledge the Southern Confederacy, slavery and all, as a matter of course. Further, any approach toward victory on our part, without freeing the slave, gives him free to Davis. So far, the South is sure to succeed, either by victory or defeat, unless we anticipate her. Indeed, the only way, the only sure way, to break this Union, is to try to save it by protecting slavery. "Every moment lost," as Napoleon said, "is an opportunity for misfortune." Unless we emancipate the slave, we shall never conquer the South without her trying emancipation. Every Southerner from Toombs up to Fremont, has acknowledged it. Do you suppose that Davis, and Beauregard, and the rest, mean to be exiles, wandering contemned in every great city of Europe, in order that they may maintain slavery and the Constitution of '89? They, like ourselves, will throw everything overboard before they will submit to defeat—defeat from Yankees. I do not believe, therefore, that reconciliation is possible, nor do I believe the Cabinet have any such hopes. Indeed, I do not know where you will find the evidence of *any* purpose in the Administration at Washington (hisses, cheers and laughter). If we look to the West, if we look to the Potomac, what is the policy? If, on the Potomac, with the aid of twenty governors, you assemble an army, and do nothing but return fugitive slaves, that proves you competent and efficient. If, on the banks of the Mississippi, unaided, the magic of your presence summons an army into existence, and you drive your enemy before you a hundred miles further than your second in command thought it possible for you to advance, that proves you incompetent, and entitles your second in command to succeed you (tremendous applause, and three cheers for Fremont).

Looking in another direction, you see the government announcing a policy in South Carolina. What is it? Well, Mr. Secretary Cameron says to the General in command there, "You are to welcome into your camp all comers; you are to organize them into squads and companies; use them in any way you please, but there is to be no general arming." That is a very significant exception. You recollect in Charles Reade's novel, "Never too Late to Mend" (a very good motto), the heroine flies away to hide from the hero, announcing that she never shall see him again. Her letter says, "I will never see you again, Edward. You, of course, won't come to see me at Mrs. Young's, at No. 126 Bond street (laughter), between 11 in the morning and 4 in the afternoon, because I shan't see you" (laughter). So Mr. Cameron says there is to be no general arming, but I suppose there is to be a very particular arming (laughter). But he goes on to add, This is no greater interference with the institutions of South Carolina than is necessary, than the war will cure. Does he mean he will give the slaves back when the war is over? I don't know. All I know is, that the Port Royal expedition proved one thing—it laid forever that ghost of an argument, that the blacks loved their masters—it settled forever the question whether the blacks were with us or with the South. My opinion is, that the blacks are the key of our position. (A VOICE—"That is it.") He that gets them wins, and he that loses them goes to the wall (applause). Port Royal settled one thing—the blacks are with us, and not with the South. At present they are the only Unionists. I know nothing more touching in history, nothing that art will immortalize and poetry dwell upon more fondly—I know no tribute to the stars and stripes more impressive than that incident of the blacks coming to the water side with their little bundles, in that simple faith which had endured through the long night of so many bitter years. They preferred to be shot rather than be driven from the sight of that banner they had so long prayed to see. And if that was the result when nothing but Gen. Sherman's equivocal proclamation was landed on the Carolinas, what should we have seen, if there had been 18,000 veterans with FREMONT, the statesman soldier of this war, at their head (loud applause), and over them the stars and stripes, gorgeous with the motto, "Freedom for all, freedom forever"? If that had gone before them, in my opinion they would have marched across the Carolinas, and joined Brownlow in East Tennessee (applause). The bulwark on each side of them would have been 100,000 grateful blacks; they would have cut this rebellion in halves, and while our fleets fired salutes across New Orleans, Beauregard would have been ground to powder between the upper millstone of McClellan, and the lower of a quarter million of blacks rising to greet the stars and stripes (great cheering). McClellan may drill a better army—more perfect soldiers. He will never marshal a stronger force than those grateful thousands. That is the way to save insurrection. He is an enemy to civil liberty, the worst enemy to his own land, who asks for such delay, or perversion of government policy, as is sure to result in insurrection. Our duty is to save these four million of blacks from their own passions, from their own confusion, and eight million of whites from the consequences of it ("hear, hear!") and in order to do it, we nineteen million of educated, Christian Americans are not to wait for the will or the wisdom of a single man—we are not to wait for Fremont or McClellan—the government is our dictator. It might do for Rome, a herd of beggars and soldiers, kept quiet only by the weight of despotism—it might do for Rome, in moments of danger, to hurl all responsibility into the hands of a dictator. But for us, educated, thoughtful men, with institutions modelled and matured by the experience of two hundred years—it is not for us to evade responsibility by deferring to a single man. I demand of the government a policy. I demand of the government to show the doubting infidels of Europe that Democracy is not only strong enough for the trial, but that she breeds men with brains large enough to comprehend the hour, and wills hot enough to fuse the purpose of nineteen million of people into one decisive blow for safety and for Union (cheers.) You will ask me how it is to be done. I would have it done by Congress. We have the power.

When Congress declares war, says John Quincy Adams, Congress has all the powers incident to carrying on war.* It is not an unconstitutional power; it is a power conferred by the Constitution; but the moment it comes into play, it rises beyond the limit of constitutional checks. I know it is a grave power, this trusting the government with despotism. But what is the use of government, except just to help us in critical times? All the checks and ingenuity of our institutions are arranged to secure for us men wise and able enough to be trusted with grave powers—bold enough to use them when the times require. Lancets and knives are dangerous instruments. The use of surgeons is, that when lancets are needed, somebody may know how to use them, and save life. One great merit of democratic institutions is, that resting, as they must, on educated masses, the government may safely be trusted, in a great emergency, with despotic power, without fear of harm, or of wrecking the State. No other form of government can venture such confidence without risk of national ruin. Doubtless the war power is a very grave power; so are some ordinary peace powers. I will not cite extreme cases, Louisiana and Texas. We obtained the first by Treaty, the second by Joint Resolutions; each case an exercise of power as grave and despotic as the abolition of slavery would be, and, unlike that, plainly unconstitutional; one which nothing but stern necessity and subsequent acquiescence by the nation could make valid. Let me remind you that seventy years' practice has incorporated it as a principle in our constitutional law, that what the necessity of the hour demands and continued assent of the people ratifies is law. Slavery has established that rule. We might surely use it in the cause of justice. But I will cite an unquestionable precedent. It was a grave power in 1807, in time of peace, when Congress abolished commerce; when, by the embargo of Jefferson, no ship could quit New York or Boston; and Congress set no limit to the prohibition. It annihilated commerce. New England asked, "Is it constitutional?" The Supreme Court said, "Yes." New England sat down and obeyed. Her wharves were worthless, her ships rotted, her merchants beggared. She asked no compensation. The powers of Congress carried bankruptcy from New Haven to Portland; but the Supreme Court said, it is legal, and New England bowed her head. We commend the same cup to the Carolinas to-day. We say to them that, in order to save the government, there resides somewhere despotism. It is in the war powers of Congress. That despotism can change the social arrangements of the Southern States, and has a right to do it. Every man of you who speaks of the emancipation of the negroes allows it would be decisive if it were used. You allow that, when it is a military necessity, we may use it. What I claim is, in honor of our institutions, that we are not put to wait for the wisdom or the courage of a General. Our fathers left us with no such miserable plan of government. They gave us a government with the power, in such times as these, of doing something that would save the helm of State in the hands of its citizens (cheers). We could cede the Carolinas. I have sometimes wished we could shovel them into the Atlantic (applause and laughter). We can cede a State. We can do anything for the time being; and no theory of government can deny its power to make the most unlimited change. The only alternative is this: Do you prefer the despotism of your own citizens, or of foreigners? That is the only question in war (cheers).

Now, this government, which abolishes my right of *habeas corpus*—which strikes down, because it is necessary, every Saxon bulwark of liberty—which proclaims martial law, and holds every dollar and every man at the will of the Cabinet—do you turn round and tell me that this same government has no power to stretch its hands across the Potomac, and root up the evil which, for seventy years, has troubled its peace, and now culminates in rebellion? I maintain, therefore, the power of the government itself to inaugurate a policy; and I say, in order to save the Union, do justice to the black (applause).

I would claim of Congress—in the exact language of Adams, of the "*government*"—a solemn act abolishing slavery throughout the Union, securing compensation to loyal slaveholders. As the Constitution forbids the States to make and allow nobles, I would now, by equal authority, forbid them to make slaves or allow slaveholders.

This has been the usual course at such times. Nations, convulsed and broken by too powerful elements or institutions, have used the first moment of assured power—the first moment that they clearly saw and fully appreciated the evil—to cut up the dangerous tree by the roots. So, France expelled the Jesuits, and the Middle Ages the Templars. So, England in her great Rebellion abolished Nobility and the Established Church; and the French Revolution did the same, and finally gave to each child an equal share in his deceased father's lands. For the same purpose, England, in 1745, abolished clanship in Scotland, the root of the Stuart faction; and we in '76 nobles and all tenure of estates savoring of privileged classes. Such a measure supplies the South just what she needs—capital. That sum which the North gives the loyal slaveholder, not as acknowledging his property in the slave, but a measure of conciliation—perhaps an acknowledgment of its share of the guilt—will call mills, ships, agriculture into being. The free negro will redeem to use lands never touched, whose fertility laughs Illinois to scorn, and finds no rival but Egypt. And remember besides, as Montesquieu says, "the yield of land depends less on its fertility than on the freedom of its inhabitants." Such a measure binds the negro to us by the indissoluble tie of gratitude—the loyal slaveholder by strong self-interest—our bonds are all his property—the other whites, by prosperity, they are lifted in the scale of civilization and activity, educated and enriched. Our institutions are then homogeneous. We grapple the Union together with hooks of steel—make it as lasting as the granite that underlies the continent.

People may say this is strange language for me—a Disunionist. Well, I was a Disunionist, sincerely, for twenty years. I did hate the Union, when Union meant lies in the pulpit and mobs in the street, when Union meant making white men hypocrites and black men slaves (cheers). I did prefer purity to peace—I acknowledge it. The child of six generations of Puritans, knowing well the value of Union, I did prefer disunion to being the accomplice of tyrants. But now, when I see what the Union must mean, in order to last; when I see that you cannot have Union, without meaning justice; and when I see twenty millions of people, with a current as swift and as inevitable as Niagara, determined that this Union shall mean justice, why should I object to it? (Loud applause.) I endeavored honestly, and am not ashamed of it, to take nineteen States out of this Union, and consecrate them to liberty; and twenty millions of people answer me back, "We like your motto, only we mean to keep thirty four States under it" (cheers). Do you suppose I am not Yankee enough to buy Union when I can have it at a fair price? (Applause and laughter.) I know the value of Union; and the reason why I claim that Carolina has no right to secede is this; we are not a partnership; we are a marriage: and we have done a great many things since we were married in 1789 which render it unjust for a State to exercise the right of revolution, on any ground now alleged. I admit the right. I acknowledge the great principles of the Declaration of Independence, that a State exists for the liberty and happiness of the people, that these are the ends of government, and that when government ceases to promote those ends, the people have a right to remodel their institutions. I acknowledge the right of revolution in South Carolina; but at the same time, I acknowledge that right of revolution only when government has ceased to promote those ends. Now we have been married for seventy years. We have bought Florida. We rounded the Union to the Gulf. We bought the Mississippi for commercial purposes. We bought Texas for slave purposes. Great commercial interests, great interests of peace have been subserved by rounding the Union into a perfect shape; and the money and sacrifices of two generations have been given for this purpose. To break up that Union now is to defraud us of mutual advantages relating to peace, trade, national security, which cannot survive disunion. The right of Revolution is not matter of caprice. "Governments long established," says our Declaration of Independence, "are not to be changed for light and transient causes." When so many important interests and benefits, in their nature indivisible and which disunion destroys, have been secured by common toils and cost, the South must vindicate her Revolution by showing that our government has become destructive of its proper ends, else the right of Revolution does not exist. Why did we buy Texas? Why have we allowed the South to strengthen herself? Because she said that slavery within the girdle of the Constitution would die out through the influence of natural principles. She said: "We acknowledge it to be an evil; but at the same time it will end by the spread of free principles, and the influence of free institutions." And the North said: "Yes; we will give you privileges on that account, and we will return your slaves for you." Every slave sent back from a Northern State is a fresh oath of the South that she would not secede. Our fathers trusted to the promise that this race should be left under the influence of the Union, until in the maturity of time the day should arrive when they would be lifted into the sunlight of God's equality. I claim it of South Carolina. By virtue of that pledge, she took Boston, and put a rope around her neck in that infamous compromise which consigned to slavery Anthony Burns. I demand the fulfilment on her part even of that infamous pledge. Until South Carolina allows me all the influence that nineteen millions of Yankee lips, asking infinite questions, have upon the welfare of those four million of bondmen, I deny her right to secede (applause). Seventy years has the Union postponed the negro. For seventy years has he been beguiled with the promise, as she erected one bulwark after another around slavery, that he should have the influence of our common institutions. I claim it to-day. Never, with my consent, while the North thinks that the Union can or shall mean justice, shall those 400,000 South Carolina slaves go beyond the influence of Boston ideas. That is my strong reason for clinging to the Union. This is also one main reason why, unless upon most *imperative* and *manifest* grounds of need and right, South Carolina has no right of revolution; none till she fulfils her promise in this